

THE  
MERCERSBURG REVIEW.

JULY, 1874.

---

ART. I.—RELATION OF CHRISTIANITY TO ART.

---

BY E. E. HIGBEE, D. D.

---

It requires but a brief survey of history to perceive the great effect which Christianity has had upon the life of the world. The old mythologies of Greece and Rome have given way before it. "The oracles are dumb." Olympus is but a vanished vision. Ægis-bearing Zeus, and Apollo with his silver bow, live only in the memories of song. The Scandinavian fables of our ancestors have yielded to its power. The shield-roofed Valhalla is a forgotten dream; and the thundering Thor, and Baldur, the beautiful, live no longer in the faith of men.

"The flocking shadows pale  
Troop to th' infernal jail,  
Each fetter'd ghost slips to his several grave:  
And the yellow-skirted Fays  
Fly after the night-steeds, leaving their moon-lov'd maze."

Not only has the *religious* life of the world been transformed by Christianity, but the whole order of civilization has come under its influence. Law and literature, philosophy and art, have been permeated by it. In fine, the whole realm of practical, theoretical, and æsthetical activity has felt its presence and power. The good, the true, and the beautiful, as well as religion, have received a new significance in the life and light

of its absolute revelation. The Sun of righteousness has risen with healing in His wings for our *whole* life. A proper pathway has been opened up before every legitimate activity of the human spirit, that it may go onward to its true completion. "Ye are" (in the whole compass of your being) "complete in Him, who is the head of all principality and power."

What we have now said may serve as a general preface to the particular theme which we wish to discuss, viz., the relation of Christianity to Art. We desire to show how faith in Christ influences the imagination or phantasy, as this latter is one of the functional activities of the human soul: how it has there a determining influence, more or less direct, in the construction of the ideal; and how in this way it comes to enter of necessity into the whole field of art.

Before entering into the discussion proper, however, we must define the terms which we use, that our meaning may not be misunderstood.

All the higher activities of the human soul have a base, we believe, in the physical, where they first show their presence in that original life-process of each one, which begins long before it comes under the clear illumination of self-consciousness. The process of thinking does not start at once with conscious thought. It has a latent lodgment in the conditioning of the life at the start. In the peculiar receptivity of material from without, the soul is theoretically active. Thinking slumbers also in every sensation, ready to be awakened. Neither do the will and the phantasy reach at once what may be regarded their full form. The will is already germinantly involved in the primitive determination of the *esse* of each individual. It is there at the very start as physical will, and as such is much more in man than plasticity or instinct, including possibilities which reach quite beyond the whole process of individuation in nature below man. So also, joined with it at the very start, as a functional activity of the soul, is the phantasy which shapes the body into an utterance of the being, into an image or type of the idea. This physical phantasy, or esemplastic power of the as yet undeveloped spirit, has, before coming into the illumina-

tion of self-consciousness, possibilities like the will which reach quite beyond the whole kindred process in nature below man, where the idea of the world in its lower stages is imaged forth in sensuous forms.

The physical will, as we have termed it, is but a beginning,—the link only where the moral movement finds itself to be not an abrupt contradiction of what has gone before. We have above this, the psychological will. Appetencies are developed as the being comes into wider relations of existence; and the power of determining comes now into the light of the advancing intelligence, and there is a crisis of choice, and a character-forming process commences. The material now coming under the determining power is not physical simply, but psychological. So also does the phantasy, inseparably connected with the whole process, rise in significance. As the physical body, an image thus far of the lower process, comes into wider relations, the psychological phantasy shows itself in language, (not artificial sign, but tone-embodiment of sentiment and thought), in gestures, in intelligent smiles and frowns, in blushes of modesty and shame, in those numberless visible and audible imagings of the inner activity of the soul,—those vanishing forms through which we look directly into the invisible spirit, or rather through which it looks out upon us from its own transparent depths, until the character is seen embodying itself before us. Here also our life in regard to what is without has passed beyond the sphere of merely outward sensation. There is an inward hearing and seeing. We mean not the power of analyzing facts empirically gained to reach the law behind and in them, but the power of seeing intuitively the manifold,—the primitive type looking out upon us directly in and through the individual form. It may seem a paradox, yet it is true, that the material upon which the phantasy is now active is psychological, not physical. The physical content of the form is giving way, passing into transparency. The physical body is transfigured, and a wider body is in process of construction. Intelligence and will and emotion can find no full objectification in mere flesh and blood.

Will, however, rises higher than the psychological sphere. It passes beyond appetencies and their organization by a self-determination which has as its end the satisfaction of some soul-impulse. It reaches, or at least it should reach, a sphere in which the ethical idea of the good enters the will in its fulness, and becomes an inner motive of conscious determination, so that the will at last is possessed with its proper content, and becomes free. Towards this end the whole process looks from the beginning. So also the phantasy meets us in this higher sphere, where the idea of the beautiful enters it with a power of inspiration, and the phantasy comes to hold within itself the pure, glowing image in which beauty is enshrined,—the ideal, which subsequently is projected into outward objective form or materialization in art. The image stands before the mind's eye, or rather there is within the spirit the "vision and the faculty divine."

By the phantasy, therefore, we mean that original architectonic power of the soul which throws the idea out into body, and which as it advances not only sees intuitively the primitive type of things through the form, but dissolves the time and space limitations in which phenomenal forms are, and builds up from within itself by a true inspiration an ideal world which shall satisfy, so far as possible, its own inward vision. Here the whole universe, visible and audible, is made to melt and flow into the inner creative process. Before there can be a world of art there must be this world of the ideal in the phantasy. The soul, attuned and inspired, must be filled with

"Hyblæan murmurs of poetic thought"

before the pen can trace a line,—must dwell in a world,

"Where the breeze warbles, and the mu'e still air  
Is music slumbering on her instrument."

"The poet's eye, in a fine frenzy rolling,  
Doth glance from heav'n to earth, from earth to heav'n,  
And as imagination bodies forth  
The forms of things unknown, the poet's pen  
Turns them to shape \* \* \*."



It must not be supposed, however, that this activity of the phantasy is isolated and arbitrary, or that the subject has been so swept away by the flow of images, that there is no proper self-possession. The organic power is within the subject, and is conditioned in its process by a determination and aim already in the genius, which is itself in turn conditioned outwardly by the spirit and culture of the age, and the occasion of inspiration, and inwardly by the physical constitution and temperament, and character. The activity of the phantasy, therefore, in the construction of the ideal is capable of being influenced. It does not stand entirely apart from the will and the intellect, but with them really inheres in the life, and enters into the progressive movement of history.

We are now prepared to define faith, and see how it can come to influence this activity so briefly and feebly characterized. In this way we can hope to secure a point of view from which to survey the relation of Christianity to art in its fundamental character.

Faith is the recognition of Christ as the very presence of the Divine among men,—as the self-unfolding glory of the Eternal in the world. As such it is the opening of our spiritual being so as to receive from God manifested in the flesh an inflow of divine life and light of which He is the absolute source and substance. The certitude and confidence which it carries with it are grounded upon the conjunction of our life with the life of God in Him. The light from its own original fountain streams in upon us and authenticates itself in the faith which is open to receive it. Just as the eye is in light, and light is in the eye in every act of vision, so here. No other evidence from any quarter can be of any account except as it comes under the illumination of such vision of God in Christ. "No man hath seen God at any time: the only begotten Son, which is in the bosom of the Father, he hath declared him." In Him we are in the life and light, and the life and light is in us. No more sublime summary of the scope of faith can be given than that which is given by St. John in the conclusion of his first Epistle. "We know that the Son of God is come, and hath given us

an understanding, that we may know him that is true; and we are in him that is true, even in his Son Jesus Christ. This is the true God and eternal life."

Our union with Christ in faith opens up the possibility of the completion of our whole being. "Of his fulness have all we received." Out of this fulness there is brought into the will and intelligence, and indeed into every faculty, the power of transcending the law of sin and death, and the warrant of entering into the heavenly. In the life of Christ present within us, the purpose of each functional activity of the soul becomes revealed; and with the revelation there is an accompanying energy rendering the accomplishment of such purpose possible. The revelation and the strength are joined in one like light and heat beaming together from the sun. Our union with Christ is the generative source of a total renewal reaching out into the infinite,—a new creation in the bosom of which old things have passed away, and the new are at hand. (2 Cor. v. 17.) Its influence upon our life, therefore, must be of the most fundamental character, reaching down to its very base in the physical, and transforming through the renewed powers which it calls into activity the whole being internal and external, together with its whole sphere of relations. Will and intellect and phantasy, and ultimately their spheres, gain by this union a divine content, and begin a movement which reaches out towards the eternal.

We have spoken of a physical epiphany of the soul in the body, where what we have termed the physical phantasy has wrought out in flesh and blood the image of the earthy. We have further spoken of a higher and less limited epiphany of the spirit in which the physical becomes as it were transparent, and the inner shines forth in those subtle forms of visibleness and audibleness which are transfigurations of the merely *sarkik* and which play upon the surface like angels hovering there from another world. We have spoken still further of that wondrous power under which all these outer images are fully melted down, giving room for a glowing image constructed within the phantasy itself,—the ideal; and then of the effort to throw this out into objective materialization in Art.

Now can we trace any influence exerted upon this whole process by the union of our life with that of Christ,—any new, quickening, glorifying energy working in upon it from the full sunlight of the Eternal beaming upon us from the presence of the Lord? To ask the question is almost to answer it. With what sublime assurance does St. Paul exclaim, “As we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the *image of the heavenly*.” We see the human in Christ, the physical even, made transparent as it were through the glory which dwelt within, until, on the threshold of its entering into the agonies awaiting it, it glows upon the Mount, as though holding within itself the very brightness of the Father’s glory. And again we see it rising out from among the dead, and as spiritual body evanishing from our sensuous gaze through the uplifted gates of heaven. This is the heavenly, whose image we shall bear, and as faith feeds upon the flesh and blood of the risen Lord, the material of such image is coming within the scope of the spirit. It doth not yet appear it is true, except in the evidencing certitude of faith. “Now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be: but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him; for we shall see him as he is.” The revelation of Christ in us shall find adequate utterance not only through will and intelligence, but also through the phantasy. It will be thrown out into visibleness, and the body of our life in Him shall be not flesh and blood, the image of the earthy, but a mystery of glory as yet unreached, although the process reaching out to it has already begun. This mystery of revelation apprehending us and being apprehended by us in faith, entering our life and the life of the world must also inspire and guide teleologically the whole movement of the ideal. Through transformation it carries our whole being, as on outstretched wings higher and higher into the infinite; and the only repose, if repose it may be called, is the beatific vision, the new heavens and the new earth. No ideal which includes only the sphere of earthly manifestation can possibly be joined with the impulse and inspiration of faith. “We all with open face, beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord, are changed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord.”

Before such vision of the heavenly as in the Lord, the religious myth, as we shall see, must fade away as empty phantasms, and with it the old form of art, but not to leave emptiness only behind. On the contrary there will be an uplifted and purified yearning, a hopeful longing, and a rapturous ardor of love to pierce through the earthly into the heavens whither He hath gone and whence He shall come again in clouds of glory,—an intent listening to catch those celestial chords of harmony whose distant echoes fall upon us, and, vibrating within the soul, tarry long enough to inspire and charm before lost in the Babel din of the world;—a base for a movement of art which shall transcend the massive symbolism of the East, and the sculptured repose of beauty which meets us in classic Greece, and the source also of historical material to attune and awaken the inspiration of genius guided by faith.

Even in the canon of the New Testament Scriptures we have left to us a striking example of an inspired Christian phantasy. Of course in the Apocalypse of St. John we have more than the inspiration of natural genius, but not in such a sense as that the lower inspiration is annihilated or set aside. We here transcend at once the whole realm of religious myth, and are not called to ascend Olympus and gaze upon the classic beauty of Jupiter and Ganymede, or to mark the barbaric pomp of Valhalla. But we do not have in St. John a mere instrument upon which the divine plectrum strikes, or a merely blank tablet upon which the gorgeous imagery is traced. The occasion of the special inspiration is at hand, and the whole spirit is attuned and becomes accordant, so that the apocalypse finds a real lodgment within. St. John, by the tyrannic hand of heathen persecution, has been driven from the pastoral care of the Churches; and in lonely banishment his anxious heart goes out to revisit the large congregations under his apostolic supervision in Asia; and the present world conflict of the Church, partially portrayed by the Old Testament prophets, is forced as it were by his circumstances into the vision of his thoughts. Especially is this the case as the Lord's day dawns upon him in his exile, and as he recalls that mysterious picture of his own future which the risen Christ drew for him in the memorable

words addressed to Peter, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?" As a response then to his own aroused and accumulating anxieties, and as a filling up of the wide expanse of his eagle-eyed intuition of the coming victory and glory of the Lord, he hears behind him the great voice, as of a trumpet saying, "I am Alpha and Omega, the first and the last, and what thou seest write, and send it unto the seven Churches." Image after image, the hidden correspondences of which we may not be able to determine, rises up before his inspired gaze, and choral bursts of song fill the heavens, louder than the surges of the ocean dashing against the rock-ribbed Patmos: and yet, although borne onward beyond the flight of natural genius and rapt in the Spirit, how plainly can we mark at every stage just that profound intuition of faith which so peculiarly characterizes all his writings. Uniformly by St. John, and with very significant emphasis, the whole Gospel is focalized in the mystery that Christ is the eternal Word, the essential revelation of the Divine, the Jehovah of the Old Testament among men, in whom the Father dwells and is seen, and out from whom the Holy Spirit is breathed. So here in the imagery of the Apocalypse Christ appears as the central glory of the great throne. He is the Jehovah, the eternal I am, the one which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty. Before Him do the prostrate worshipers cast their crowns and chant their hallelujahs. Indeed the preface before the vision begins is in perfect accord with the vision itself,—is an overture to the grand Messiah, like the proem of his gospel. And so also, when the new Jerusalem has come down and God Himself is with His people visibly, and when, with this grand consummation, the organic inspiring presence that guided St. John's phantasy has become calmed into ordinary vision, the glow seems yet to linger within his soul as part of his own being, the crimson glory of a sun receding from vision but not lost, in that touching prayer, "Even so come, Lord Jesus"—*This is for him God dwelling among men.* It is quite vain to say that we have not here the *poietic* power of St. John, although we hesitate not to acknowledge that we have more. It is nothing less than absurd to suppose that a Pindar, or an Æschy-

lus, or a Homer, or an Isaiah even, could have been the recipients of such an inspiration, or that any such ideal could have found lodgment in an imagination not attuned by the revelation of the Gospel.

We have already intimated that where Christian faith prevails the myth-forming process must of necessity pass away. We may call this the negative relation of Christianity to art. The myth is a product of the phantasy penetrated and aroused by the idea of religion. This idea demands the supernatural, just as much as the eye does light. It looks towards a real union of our life with the infinite. In the absence of any self-revelation of God, save the mediate revelation in nature and man, to answer the Spirit's need in the direction of the supernatural, the idea of religion not destroyed, but, because unsatisfied, filling the soul with a sense of hunger and thirst, reached in upon the phantasy with intense power universally in heathendom. And just as physical hunger and thirst, in proportion to their intensity bring up the visionary play of sumptuous tables and cool fountains and flowing streams, mere phantasms and a mockery of satisfaction in the end; so here the phantasy thus vehemently impelled to activity constructed the myth, a dream of the supernatural and divine, colored by that which in the national life was regarded as most absolute and unchanging. St. Augustine, when referring to the mythical elements involved in the Manichæan heresy, has well expressed this truth in a remarkable passage of his *Confessions*. "They placed before me in their dishes splendid phantasm (*phantasmata splendida*) \* \* \* ; and yet I ate thereof, because I thought them to be Thee; not eagerly however, for Thou didst not taste in my mouth as Thou art, for Thou art not these empty figments. Neither was I nourished thereby, but only more famished. Food in sleep is very like the food of those awake: yet by it the sleeping are not fed, because they are asleep."\*

---

\* "*Esuriebam et sitiebam; et apponebantur adhuc mihi in illis ferculis phantasmata splendida* \* \* \* ; et tamen, quia te putabam, manducabam; non avide quidem, quia nec sapiebas in ore meo, sicut es; neque enim tu eras figmenta illa inania; nec nutriebar eis, sed exauriebar magis. Cibus in somnis simillimus est cibis vigilantium, quo tamen dormientes non aluntur; dormiunt enim." *Lib. III. c. vi.*

Now faith, which realizes the presence of the absolute revelation, which recognizes that the Word was God, and was made flesh and dwelt among us, so satisfies the whole idea of religion, and so turns the now filled spirit towards the coming glory of which it already partakes, that the myth-impulse is for the Christian forever dissipated. Indeed it is of necessity viewed as in direct hostility to the reality of faith. The two cannot harmonize. Thus it is that this element of religious myth, so thoroughly inwoven in the poetry and sculpture and architecture which confronted Christianity at the start, called out that instinctive impulse of faith to reject the art wealth which surrounded it in the Greek and Roman world. Moreover, the Church in those early ages, called so immediately to the practical work of establishing its faith, and this too in the face of most persistent and vengeful resistance, had neither opportunity nor ability to replace what it rejected. Indeed this from the very nature of the case could not be done at once. The art of the Church had to be a growth from within the life of Christianity itself, and its ideal something quite distinct from that which ruled in the classic world.

In the *classic* world there was certainly an advance beyond the symbolic character of Oriental art. The personal, human spirit here asserts itself, and the symbol gives way to the human form. In the perfectness of the human body the spirit finds its manifestation. There is a marriage of the spirit and the physical form of manifestation, in which both seem to find an eternal repose. The spirit has blossomed into flesh, and so remains retained by the immortal sculpture of the Greek masters. The Titanic physical, quantitative mass and dynamic force, has been overcome, and the spiritual human has displaced the symbolic, elemental deities. But in the classic art no ideal has been reached in which there is a transcendence of this merely earthly repose of spirit in sensuous form, or where there is a disruption through death so as to open the way for the blossoming of flesh into Spirit. The resurrection is not grasped. The resurgent, spiritual body, the image of the heavenly, enters not into the Greek phantasy. No words perhaps can more



thoroughly express what was lacking here universally in the Greek spirit than those spoken by the Saviour when the disciples informed Him that certain Greeks desired to see Him. "The hour is come that the Son of man should be glorified. Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die it bringeth forth much fruit." The Greeks are turned to a mystery in nature as involving a lesson that their ideal world, the material of which in reality embraced nothing beyond the present earthly sphere of manifestation, must be renounced and crumble away to give room for a real spiritual transformation, in which the image of the earthly shall be dissolved, and the image of the heavenly spring up as a fruit out from the dead. Death and resurrection thus joined together seemed to the Greek mere foolishness, as a complete rupture of his repose of the beautiful; and Christianity could not from the very content of its faith, either assume or rejuvenate the already decaying movement of Classic art. Its attitude here again was negative, not however as in the interest of illiterate boorishness, according to Lucian's taunting sneer, nor from an extreme puritan rejection of the beautiful, although there may have been danger of this; but because it stood itself in the bosom of a new creation in which the old had passed away, and in which a new body must be formed by a phantasy inspired and moving within its own new sphere.

While therefore rejecting the pagan myth, and unfriendly to the surrounding world of art in which the mythical was so intimately and universally inwoven, and while turned toward a real glory beyond the grave which made more deep the sense of the evanescent beauty of the Greek ideal, it must not be supposed that Christianity rejected art itself, or that the presence of faith despoiled the human spirit of one of its most original and powerful functional activities.

Already at the earliest period, the new emotions awakened by the revelation of Christ,—the new consciousness of full reconciliation in the union of our life with that of God,—the new experiences of the spirit illumined by the glory of the Sun of righteousness flooding in upon it,—the depths of penitence and

heights of love hitherto unreachd,—the thrill of joy and the seraphic fervor of adoration,—the seasons of rapturous vision, when, although at the blazing stake, or among the wild beasts in the amphitheatre, yet as

“\* \* in an hour of solemn jubilee,  
The massy gates of Paradise were thrown  
Wide open, and forth came in fragments wild  
Sweet echoes of unearthly melodies  
And odors snatched from beds of Amaranth,”

—in fine, this whole new, inner world of inquickened spiritual sensibilities centering in Christian worship was laying at the very start the deep and broad foundations of such a structure of lyric grandeur as the world had never seen, and was generating such a living mass of new æsthetic material as would of itself burst the too narrow restraints of classic art.

Most naturally in the element of the lyric did the art of the Christian Church begin. In the irrepressible impulse to give utterance to the adoring spirit as drawn heavenward by our ascended Lord the faith-inspired phantasy commenced its work. It is true there was at hand for this end much material from the Old Testament, in “Job’s pathetic plaint” and “rapt Isaiah’s wild, seraphic fire,” and in the Psalms of David, with perhaps the old temple music: but all this had to be reorganized around a new centre and new festivals,—had to be wrought up into a new and higher Christian cultus. Soon, we hardly know how soon, the early Greek liturgies, so rich in lyric power and fullness, blossomed into being.

What a contrast between these liturgies as creations of the lyric genius of the Church and the very best lyric compositions of the Greek poets! The religious Pindar almost ceases to be lyric in spite of the native fervor of his genius because the myths which he uses have no real power over his soul. He himself stands above them, and they do his bidding. In them lie hidden the ‘*hæc fabula docet.*’ He becomes didactic. The mythic tales, instead of opening up before him a heavenly world which thrills his spirit, are selected, as he himself says,

like darts from a quiver to strike a blow of reproof, or encouragement, or warning. The rhythm is exquisite. The sculptured form is faultless; but the lyric throb is not there, for the very use which he makes of the myths is a dissolution in thought of all the inspiration of faith in them. Now turn from the very best ode of Pindar with all its marble purity of form, rivalling in this regard the choicest work of Phidias, to the so-called Liturgy of St. James, and mark what a new, fresh lyric glory is brought to view as dawning upon the world. It receives its light and warmth from the self-same faith which inspired the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews to call up, not the Olympic conquerors, but the crowned athletes of the old Covenant as encompassing clouds of witnesses, and then at last, as in flight towards the ascended Lord, to burst forth into the triumphant pæan, "Ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels." Indeed the part of the liturgy which we now quote in way of illustration is the expansion of this into a rapturous eucharistic prayer.

"It is very meet, right and our bounden duty that we should praise Thee, sing hymns to Thee, bless Thee, worship Thee, glorify Thee, and give thanks unto Thee, maker of the whole creation visible and invisible, the treasure of eternal good, the fountain of life and immortality, the God and Lord of all, whom the heaven, and the heaven of heavens adore, and all the powers therein, the sun and moon and the whole choir of stars, the earth and sea and all that is therein, Jerusalem the heavenly assembly, the Church of the first-born written in heaven, the spirits of just men and of prophets, the souls of martyrs and apostles, angels, archangels, thrones, dominions, principalities, and powers, and fearful dynasties, the many-eyed Cherubim and winged Seraphim crying one to another with never-ceasing voice, and uninterrupted shouts of praise, singing with loud voice the triumphal hymn of Thine exalted glory, and saying, "Holy, holy, holy Lord God of hosts. Heaven and earth are full of Thy glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is He that cometh in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest."

Where can you find a deeper lyric glow, a more rapturous sweep of enkindled emotions? There seems to be an ecstatic thrill of joy which strives in vain to utter itself; and when the words have ceased there yet lingers in the heart a throbbing music, like the "choral harmonies of heaven."

The liturgies with their wondrous harmony of parts, crystalizing around the eucharist, the organization of festivals in the cycle of the Church year in such form as to make the whole organism an advancing epiphany of Christ's glory, and the developing hymns reaching to the sublimity of the Ambrosian 'Te Deum,' show the presence of a creative phantasy of extraordinary power and significance, the dawn of what has been termed *romantic art*. This we have at the very beginning. But there must be added to this the Gothic Cathedrals with their pinnaced spires, the frescoed walls, the stained windows, the sounding organs, and the pealing bells, before the lyric ideal has fully uttered itself. Indeed at the start we have not only the lyric side in prayers and hymns and music, but the side of representation also. In the catacombs the rude crosses and monograms of Christ, the pictures of the good shepherd, and the Virgin Mother and the martyred saints, were in reality the first infant gropings of that phantasy whose creations meet us subsequently in the master-pieces of Raphael and Angelo and others.\*

Christianity then was not hostile to art as art. Faith did not seek, as some suppose, to overthrow the phantasy as though it were an abnormal illegitimate activity of the human spirit. Such a work would be irrational and vain, as much so as to seek to overthrow the will and the intellect. Faith does not live by any auto-da-fe of our rational moral life, but is ever

---

\* "En effet, le Christianisme vient; il donne aux derniers de ses croyants le sens des choses qui ne se voient pas et ne se mesurent pas: les ouvriers des catacombes décorant de peintures les tombeaux des martyrs; ils travaillent à la lueur de la lampe et sous la menace des persécutions. Ils représentent le Christ, la Vierge, les apôtres, des chrétiens en prières. Ces figures trahissent quelquefois une grande inexpérience, souvent les proportions leur manquent; mais tout le ciel est dans leurs yeux. Le sentiment de l'infini remplit ces fresques." *Oev. Com. de A. F. Ozanam*, tom. i. 34.

active in interfusing that life with the life and light of the eternal Word.

Although, as we have said, there was a necessary hostility upon the part of the Church to the art-world of Greece and Rome, where the religious myth was all-pervading, and art and religion seemed one; and although there was the presence of an ideal, which, reaching beyond what the classic or oriental world could grasp, necessitated a new movement in which Christianity had to stand in a great measure isolated from the art-culture and civilization of the age: yet in this very isolation the new inspiring life of faith was apprehending the phantasy: and just as in retired nooks and by shadowy streams half hidden from the vulgar eye in sheltering moss the coming summer doth smile in rare violets, and fragrant arbutus, and nodding anemones, so the coming fulness of Christian art found a budding utterance in those precious world-hidden blossoms of worship to which we have referred. For the most part refined heathenism, proud in the garish summer of its own glory, had neither disposition nor power to see or to feel this. To the pagan this small unsightly root bore no bright golden flower. The leaf was darkish and had prickles on it. Heedless or with persecuting malice he trod on it daily with his clouted shoon,

“And yet more med’cinal was it than that moly  
That Hermes once to wise Ulysses gave.”

We do not mean that the Church stood in such relation to art as to refuse entirely the art-forms which were at hand in the culture of the Roman Empire. Inadequate as these were, and calculated to fetter the utterance of her own freer spirit, yet the Western Church did, before the overthrow of the Empire, attempt to pour the new wine of her lyric spirit into the old bottles of Latin versification: but those bottles burst. The sculptresque structure of the classic period gave way, and a new form of Latin poetry gradually developed itself, moving by accents and rhyme more and more varied and rich in harmonic relations as the advance went on. The hymns of the Church, commencing as far back even as St. Hilary and St. Ambrose,

were as different almost in form from the lyrics of Horace as they were in content.\* Many may seek to account for this by saying that it was the result of a prevailing ignorance of the principles of classic versification,—a boorishness of latinity. Even grant it: yet the form is there universally, and with such plastic power as to enter into the whole sphere of poetry in all the modern languages of Western Europe, conquering not only the classical metrical system, but the alliterative method of the whole Teutonic race.† The form is there, woven by the phantasy with an unmistakable significance of pattern only the more impressive if the warp and woof were worked in without a knowledge of Latin prosody. Yet it were strange indeed if the Roman governor Ambrose, on whose infant lips the bees left honey, and the thoroughly trained Augustine, who in his youth excelled all in the rhetoric school of Carthage, and subsequently was professor in Rome,—it were strange indeed if such men should ignorantly and blunderingly mutilate the old versification. No! On the contrary already the faith-inspired phantasy, as by a kind of proleptic vision, was shaping more adequate forms for that new world which was fast approaching, when the imperial diadem should be dismissed to the East, and barbaric chieftains should occupy the throne of the Cæsars, and a new civilization and culture fill the untamed forests of northern and western Europe.

A new problem confronted the Church when the barbaric invasion swept over the Roman Empire. Christianity in its first contact with the Roman world met a civilization and culture fully developed, and already past its zenith. This whole culture also arrayed itself in deadly hostility against the mission of the Church. The police, literature, and religion of the State persecuted, ridiculed and blasphemed. And at last when Christianity had conquered all opposition and was reorganizing

---

\* See hymn of St. Hilary sent to his daughter. *St. Hilarii Opera*, Tom. II. 552. Migne Edition.

† See the valuable essay on the origin of rhymes in Mediæval poetry, by Thomas Wright. *Essays on Archæology*, Vol. 2, p. 151.

the forces of the old civilization, her work was cut short in this direction by the "waves of population which chased each other with tempestuous fury, and broke maddening over the feeble barriers of the Empire." To meet this angry storm, the secular resources of the State were in vain. The Master must be awakened and rebuke the winds and the sea. A new and different mission thus challenged Christianity, and the new era of Mediæval history began.

The three great factorial forces entering into it were, 1. The old Roman civilization, overthrown in its political form, but still a living and leavening power; 2. The new genius of the barbaric world yet undeveloped, but with possibilities that seem to be boundless; and 3. The Christian Church now well organized and prepared for her work. The reconciliation and organic settlement of these three forces now brought together with no great external hostility, but first *massed* together as it were, required ages. Christianity found itself now not in the relation of a persecuted and proscribed sect; but through the rapid conversion of the barbaric tribes, it entered into the whole process of development through which the Teutonic life was to reach modern civilization and culture. The art forms, therefore, which the Teutonic genius was to assume were to a great extent brought under the moulding power of Christianity from the beginning. In other words Mediæval art must show itself as the product of a phantasy in which the inspiring presence of the Christian ideal will assert its power, not, however, in its proper fulness, for the Mediæval world is after all only a struggle toward reconciliation,—a sort of necessary antithesis of the factors of freedom,—a rupture and disjunction to open the way for a real, internal union, and not one of mere mass, or at most only external.

The art of the Middle Ages, therefore, while it may be called Christian art, yet partakes of the peculiar characteristics which belong to the life of that period. The phantasy gives utterance to the inner spirit of the age, builds a body for it, throws it out into visibleness in the way of art. In this manifestation we see unmistakably, it is true, the presence of Christianity;



for we recognize through the whole cycle of Mediæval art a restless reaching out into the infinite; a vision of the eternal from within; a soaring of the spirit heavenward, like a cathedral spire which trembles and thrills with a sense of that towards which it reaches: but, at the same time, we see also the presence of an age in which there is as yet no proper inward reconciliation of the forces at work, while the necessity of such reconciliation seems to act as an inward impulse which all the while comes to be more and more deeply felt and acknowledged. The old Teutonic polytheism gave way before the monotheism of Christianity. Neither Woden nor Thor continued to be worshiped. But below these "*Dii Majores*" of the old faith there was a vast mythological world, not regarded as strictly divine, but as superhuman and yet most intimately interwoven with the whole earthly life, and especially powerful in proportion as the life was further removed from the resources and defences of civilization. This mythical world was a sort of dreamy counterpart (constructed by the phantasy and taking the place) of the reality of ministering spirits and fallen angels, which meets us in the divine revelation. It still continued as a power in the inner spirit of the barbaric life. If the Germans were, as Tacitus says, "*securi adversus Deos*," and had a very meagre external cultus, yet in the absence of temples and images and costly rites, they clung only the more closely to their consecrated groves, and that inner adoration and reverence which enshrined for them the divine, and they were exceedingly tenacious of that element of religious fable which was domesticated in every family.\* Although converted to Christianity and forsaking the deities they had worshiped, yet they still felt the thrill of this old mythology, now transferred by them to the demoniacal world of evil, so as to be retained in their faith. The truth of faith

---

\* "*Ceterum, nec cohibere parietibus deos, neque in ullam humani oris speciem adsimulare, ex magnitudine celestium arbitrantur: lucos ac nemora consecrant, deorumque nominibus appellant secretum illud: quod sola reverentia vident. Auspicia, sortesque, ut maxime, observant.*" Tac. *Op. Tom. vi. page 14.* Brotier Edit.

here took into itself a mass of mystic fables to overthrow it in its old form by grafting into it a new meaning. The motive of the effort, we believe, so far as encouraged by the church, was earnest and sincere; but it brought faith into a sort of contradiction with itself, and developed a peculiar religious superstition which it is very difficult to characterize.

The inner conflicts of the soul, the temptations and cross-purposes assailing the life now turned towards God, the inward struggles towards true spiritual freedom, the deep, secret moral warfare of the spirit, were in a peculiar manner interwoven with the old mythological fables, and turned by a disguised commingling of faith and superstition into an outer phantastic conflict, not with Satan going about as a roaring lion, seeking whom he may devour, but with dragons, and giants and mythic beasts of terror in real flesh and blood and poison. But not only did this more serious aspect of life flow into the old and as yet unsubdued mythic spirit, but the comical also, which in a deep sense aims at reconciling antagonisms, intermingled itself in the same way with the cunning tricks of fairies and elves of the old mythology.\*

This inward contradiction between the old myths and the new content given them continued through the progress of the middle ages, and worked upon the phantasy, and through it gained expression in the strange, grotesque legends and romances, with their dragons, and chimeras, and griffins, and Saracenic conflicts, and magic rings and charms, which constituted so largely the poetical material of that period, and the faith of which we see dissolving in the rich allegory of Spenser's *Fairy Queen*. The miracles take frequently a very fantastic character, and the saints often seem to be rivals, as it were, of the old mythic heroes in strange adventures and deeds which show scarcely any moral purpose.† The heroic *Beowulf* seems

\* See Wright's *Essays on the Middle Ages*, vol. 1, 261 et passim; and also see his article on "Friar Rush and the frolicsome elves," vol. 2 of the same work.

† This has been so much felt as to render plausible almost the conjecture that the lives of many of the saints were but rhetorical examples of amplification, trial tests of talent in this direction among the students of the monastic colleges. See "*Curiosities of Lit.*," Disraeli, vol. 1, p. 148.

to have returned again, staying the *nickers* about the bubbling fords, and destroying the *grendels* which infested the court of Hrothgar. The weapons, however, are no longer the war-bill or the twisted war-dress, legacy of Hraedla, but the shield of faith, the breastplate of hope, the helmet of chastity, the bow of penance, and the arrows of psalmody, ("scutum fidei, lorica spei, galeam castitatis, arcum poenitentiae, sagittas psalmodiae").

Even in the Gothic cathedral, where the ideal of Christianity most thoroughly penetrated the Teutonic genius (for here it was the spirit of divine worship which specially controlled the phantasy), while we see the sublime grandeur of the rising spire as though to pierce the heavens—the flight of spirit uplifting the body from earth into the light of the heavenly—the tone of aspiring love whose echoes are losing themselves in the infinite, and not the silent, calm repose of beauty looking earthward as in the Greek temple; yet we see also in the details of the structure, fully subordinated however (for here the inspiration gave strength to do it), grotesque figures looking out upon us here and there, suppressed glances of the old mythic world hiding itself in nooks and corners, pranks of the mediæval phantasy, which the glory of the whole structure alone could and did subdue into harmony in much the same way as the grandeur of a great tragedy of Shakspeare brings into fitting accord the scenes of comic relief which are introduced.

The grotesque, however, shows itself much more the further we remove from the focal inspiration of worship. On the stalls in the old cathedrals strange tales are carved, as though the fantastic must have place to satisfy the demands of the age. The *maiden and the unicorn*, the *preaching fox*, and the *witch with her cats* are only examples out of many others that might be mentioned. (See Wright's *Ess. on Archæology*, vol. 2, p. 111, et passim.)

Whenever we turn to the sphere in which Christianity concentrated its power and most fully revealed its presence, there

we see at once how art becomes filled with a new inspiration. The cathedral church as a monument of worship we have already mentioned as an example. The same is true of the religious services therein. One element here may be said to be almost the creation of Christianity, viz., *music*. In this the lyric glory enshrined in the cultus of the Church blossomed forth into a marvellous world of art of which in such form the ancients knew but little. The inner life of faith in which the spirit finds its fullest freedom, and recognizes its heavenly destiny,—in which the soul is touched as by a fire from heaven and flames upward towards God, requires the most spiritual medium of expression, and cannot possibly rest satisfied with architecture or sculpture. It impels the phantasy to throw itself into those arts especially where the sensuous form is furthest removed from materialness, and approximates nearest the spiritual. Painting, and especially music, where the form is ever vanishing with the expression and becoming part of the spirit itself, must, therefore, find in Christianity the central source of their highest inspiration. Music indeed in its very nature is most closely allied to religion in which we commune with the infinite, where neither thought nor act, but above all the heart filled with child-like adoration, and thrilling with penitential love and rejoicing hope seeks to unbosom itself in God.

It is impossible perhaps to say definitely when music became a part of Christian worship.\* Probably in the East the church immediately took up the old Temple music, so far as this was

---

\* Eusebius thinks that the Therapeutæ, whom Philo describes as passing their time in meditation, composing songs and hymns in every variety of metre and tune of solemn character, were Christians (lib. II. c. 17). Lucian reproaches the Christians for spending the nights in chanting. Pliny makes mention of the same custom as peculiar to the Christians. Cassianus describes two kinds of psalmody among the oriental monks, one in Egypt and the Thebaid, and another in Palestine and Mesopotamia. Socrates regards antiphonal chanting as originating with Ignatius (Ecol. Hist. Lib. VI. c. 8). Theodoret makes the custom to originate with Flavian and Diodorus (Ecol. Hist. Lib. II. 24). For valuable information see Card. Bona de Divina Psalmodia, c. i. § 3 and § 4, and also J. Mabillon de Lib. Gallicana, p. 382 et passim, where he has appended a brief "disquisitio de cursu Gallicano."

possible. At the last Supper, the disciples with the Saviour sang the Hallel. We know, however, that St. Ambrose organized this art element as part of the church service at Milan, after the manner of the eastern churches,\* and that his practice was rapidly followed by others. St. Augustine's fervid nature was so deeply stirred by it, that he feared his delight was in danger of passing by the content of the hymn and lodging itself in the music only (see Conf. Lib. X. cap. xxxiii.) "O how in Thy hymns and canticles," he exclaims, "did I weep, stirred in the depths of my soul by the voices of Thy sweetly sounding church" (Conf. Lib. IX. cap. vi.) Indeed St. Augustine, as revealed in his Confessions, may be cited as a fitting illustration of that power of Christian inspiration which roused the phantasy and gave to it that peculiar movement which shows itself in *romantic art*. His Confessions are a pathetic cry of pain and joy, a thrilling deep-toned lyric of life whose pathos is unequalled. In what words could we better express the power with which Christianity touched and attuned the phantasy than in those which this saint used when speaking of himself. "Thou didst call and cry aloud and break through my deafness. Thou didst flash and gleam and scatter my blindness. Thou didst breathe fragrance upon me, and I drew in my breath and sighed for Thee. I tasted, and lo I hunger and thirst. Thou didst touch me, and I flamed toward Thy peace."† That sense of the infinite, that depth of spiritual introversion, the soul returning into itself and seeking there some adequate form of utterance, that inward glance which, having caught a vision of the eternal, no outward sensuous form thereafter can satisfy, which characterizes romantic art, how perfectly does St. Augustine define it! "What love I, O

---

\* "Tunc hymni et psalmi ut canerentur secundum morem orientalium partium, ne populus mœroris tœdio contabesceret, institutum est; et ex illo in hodiernum retentum, multis jam ac pene omnibus gregibus tuis, et per cœtera orbis imitantibus." Conf. S. Aug. Lib. IX. cap. vii.

† "Vocasti et clamasti et rupisti surditatem meam. Corrucecasti, splenduisti, et fugasti cœcitatem meam. Fragasti, et duvi spiritum, et anhelo tibi. Gustavi, et esurio, et sitio. Tetigisti me, et exarsi in pacem tuam." (Conf. Lib. X. c. xxvii.)

Lord, when loving Thee? Not the beauty of body, not the ornament of rhythm, not the splendor of light, not the sweet melodies of ever varying songs, not the fragrance of flowers and perfumes and spices, not manna and honey, not the delights of flesh. Not these do I love, my God, when loving Thee. And yet I love a certain light and voice and odor and food and delight deep within the soul, where shines before my spirit what defies all place, where sounds within my ears what no time can measure, and where breathes a fragrance which no breeze can scatter" (Conf. Lib. X. cap. vi.) It seems as though J. P. Richter might have had this passage in his mind when he wrote that charming definition, so often praised: "Romantic art is the beautiful without limitation, or the beautiful infinite. It is the pulsing murmur of a chord or bell, whose waves of tone float into distance further and further, and at last lose themselves in us, outwardly hushed indeed, but sounding still within."

It is not strange that St. Ambrose and St. Augustine, secluded by the new inner world, revealed to them by faith more and more from the culture of heathenism, that old civilization which they could not save, but which they aided and "whose funeral they honored,"—it is not strange, we repeat, that they should feel an impulse to give utterance to the glowing inward vision and thrill of their spirit; and here it is that the Ambrosian hymns and music find their inspiration. They are the reddening dawn of that lyric glory of the Christian Church which has astonished and delighted the world,—a gush of Spring, telling of a coming summer, just before the wintry blasts from the stormy North swept over Italy and blighted Africa with untimely destruction.

The Ambrosian music of course was crude and simple in its structure, but so livingly rooted in the Christian life as to be capable of an almost infinite growth and expansion. If its modes were borrowed from the old Greek music, yet the new lyric content must have conditioned at the very start the whole form, and made necessary that new movement which at last broke through all restraints, but which required the advance of

centuries to reveal the vast resources of inspiration to which it began.\*

To the Ambrosian keys others were added two centuries later by Gregory of Rome; and the Gregorian chant became an important element of Christian instruction. Karl, the Great, following the example of his father, Pepin,† was anxious to extend its correct use throughout the Frankish kingdom, and to introduce its study into his schools. To this end he established two central schools of music, one at Metz, and another at Soissons, in which he introduced the Roman Gregorian chant over against the Gallican corruption of the same. These schools were what may be called normal schools to prepare the choir-masters for their work, and to help on the more general movement in the ordinary schools. The king went so far even as to require the rustics when driving their cattle to and from pasture to sing the canticles of the church on their way.

No one perhaps can fully measure the educational power which the Gregorian chant, thus widely cultivated, had upon the Mediæval world. It is one of the special prerogatives of such music to break the license of passion and calm down its violence, to free the soul for the time being from its carnal bondage, and lift it into a more serene and purer atmosphere of sentiment and sympathy. Even now whenever in our modern church music the tones of these old melodies so solemn and so tender are allowed to reach us, though but rarely, they touch the spirit like echoes from heaven.‡

\* There is no evidence, however, that the so-called *Cantus Ambrosianus* borrowed anything from the Greek beyond the mere technical nomenclature. The four Ambrosian keys came to be distinguished by the titles, Doric, Phrygic, Lydic, and Myxolydic, but not in the sense that they were so many attempts to reproduce the Greek forms. See article in *Journal of Spec. Phil.* vol. 1, p. 225. Pub. at St. Louis, Mo.

† "Moraebi ut cantum Romanum pleniter et ordinabiliter per nocturnale vel gradale officium peragant, secundum quod beatæ memoriæ genitor noster Pippinus rex decertavit ut fieret." Migne, Tom. xvii. p. 518.

‡ Efforts have been made to revive the use of this Gregorian music in the services of the English church. In this interest quite a valuable work has been published by Rev. Thomas Helmore, Precentor of St. Mark's Coll., in which the *canto fermo* is given with accompanying harmonies, and with a translation of the Latin Hymns.



The inspiring breath of Christian worship did not cease with these simple beginnings of religious music. Assuming at once what was at hand, and striving to animate it with its own content, or rather seeking through it to gain expression for itself, the new spirit of Christianity found here again that the old forms were inadequate. They could not answer for the deeper mystery of the Christian ideal in the sphere of sensibility. The sense of reconciliation between God and man, the presence of redeeming grace, the ever-widening hope full of life and immortality, reaching beyond the finite and grasping the infinite, the ever-deepening consciousness of the full glorification of our life in Christ, moving through struggle and suffering to victory and exaltation, the penitential sadness of Lent, the Easter glow of choral triumph, and the heavenward breathing sigh of the Ascension,—all this, stirring the depths of the soul as never before, and entering through the services of the church into the ever-recurring cycle of the year, developed a new world of sensibilities,\* and the phantasy now required something more than the sculptured singleness of the old forms to satisfy its needs. The plain chant without being lost must be led beyond itself into the deeper spiritual form-world of melody and harmony combined; and here a process meets us resembling the kindred one to which we have referred where the lyric poetry of the church moves from the classic prosody onward into that rich blending of accentuation and rhyme which characterizes the modern form. From Ambrose and Gregory we must follow the movement through the Middle ages to Palestrina, and onward still to Bach and Handel, if we would properly measure the power which Christianity exercised upon the development of art in this sphere.

---

\* The genial Ozanam has eloquently written: "*Ses rites réunissaient dans leur ensemble toutes les traditions bibliques, la poésie des psaumes et des prophéties, les récits du Nouveau Testament, les actes des martyrs, l'éloquence des Pères, les travaux liturgiques de Saint Ambroise et de saint Grégoire, avec l'essor que la musique donne au sentiment, avec le soutien que la peinture prête à la pensée, avec tout le pouvoir de l'architecture religieuse, pour retenir dans ses murailles l'âme ébahie, lui faire oublier le monde, et l'élever à Dieu.*" *Oeuvres Comp.* chap. vii. 319, Tom. iv.

But vocal music is not all that meets us here. In addition to the song and voice, instrumental music is taken up. The instrument becomes an organ through which the phantasy reveals its ideal; and hence for the fulness of Christian inspiration, the lyre of Mercury, the pipes of Pan, and Minerva's flute were inadequate. So also were the psaltery and harp and trumpet of the Jew. Teutonic Christian phantasy necessitated the construction of an *organon pneumaticon* (rightly so called), which could give fuller utterance to its spiritual inspiration with its multiplied registers and sounding pipes; and the new movement went on in this sphere until we reach the wonderful symphonies of Beethoven, the Shakspeare of music, whose sweep of genius gathers for its use all instruments, and then reaches beyond the inadequate means of utterance thus afforded and falls back to hear within the soul only that ideal music, which neither voice nor instruments can utter, which points to heaven and will not pass away.

As we have found Christianity to be the central source of music as this has been developed in the modern world, and for this reason, because through the spiritual impulse of faith the whole emotional nature of the soul was aroused from its innermost depths, and the spirit in its enkindled ardor flamed heavenward toward the peace and rest of the infinite, so also in an equally profound sense is Christianity related to the whole development of modern painting. These two forms of art were less cultivated or at least less developed than any others in antiquity, and yet they are the very forms of expression which most especially characterized the opening activity of the phantasy of the modern period. This is by no means accidental. The full revelation of the divine involves of necessity the highest inspiration of the human. The revelation to be such and not a mere outward theophany required that the human spirit should be emancipated from its earthly bondage, and brought into communion with God,—that it should come to see by a true inward illumination the surrounding spiritual world, and be filled with a sense of its own original relation to that life in the eternal Word which is the light of men. Faith,

which reaches beyond the evidencing of flesh and blood and in which alone the revelation can become real, thus serves to bring the human spirit to a proper sense of itself, to a consciousness, ever growing clearer, of its own infinite worth and eternal destiny. When, therefore, under the impulse of faith the spirit seeks expression for itself through the phantasy, the medium of expression must be as far as possible the product of the spirit itself. The life of Christ within us, the hope of glory, in the end, as we have said, constructs for itself a spiritual body. Faith involves this. Its vision is not after the flesh but after the spirit. The visible here, therefore must be spiritualized. By faith the whole realm of phenomenal nature is at once referred to its invisible spiritual substratum in the Word, and is made to look forward to a glorification corresponding to what is involved in the mystery of spiritual body. The Christian ideal, therefore, whenever seeking to embody itself, must give a powerful stimulus to just that range of art where nature spiritualized enters most prominently into the mode of expression.

It is true that in music, where the form of expression is of itself almost immaterialized, where it enters into and becomes part of the spirit itself, we have an art with which the spirit of Christianity perhaps more readily affiliated itself; yet in light and color so full of vanishing changes, and yet so deeply entering into the spiritual, so dynamically active in contrasts and harmonies as to be almost what might be termed visible sounds, and yet in the appearance so much the creation of the spirit itself which speaks and glances through and in them,—so full of soul as to be the symbol of spiritual life, and the very language of the otherwise mute earth on which we tread and the heavens into which we gaze, for the earth and heavens speak through the green grass and the varying sunlight in the plighted clouds, as much as the empty air through the voiceful winds; yet, we repeat, in light and color interfused with spiritual content and made to be instinct with spiritual activity, and thus a living mirror of the inner soul, we have a medium of representation which the phantasy conditioned by Christianity

can most naturally and readily assume as specially fitted for the utterance of its ideal. Painting, as one of the romantic arts, is indebted to Christianity for the initial impulse and the sustaining inspiration which have given to it in the modern world a development so vastly beyond what it reached in the old world of classic art.

As already remarked, the persecuted Christians of the earliest period, of whom the world was not worthy, seeking refuge in the dark windings of the Catacombs whither they carried the charred relics of their martyred brethren, could not fail, as they placed them in their last resting-place, either to leave some token of the triumph of *their* birthday into glory or to surround themselves with some visible pledges of their own unvanquished faith, and hence by the lantern's flickering light they represented along the walls Christ, the Virgin, the Apostles and Christians at prayer, with rude execution and faulty proportions it is true, but with the light of heaven in their eyes and a sense of the infinite animating their face.\* Here we have the first incipient manifestation of that powerful impulse which after subsequent ages gave such inspiration to the art of painting as almost to bind it to Christianity as to its fostering nurse. It is just this victory over suffering *in* suffering, this pathos of hope and love rising infinitely above a merely passive acquiescence in fate or a stoic autarchy, in which the supposed escape from suffering is but a frigid repression of the emotional life of the soul itself,—it is just this triumph of martyrdom where death is swallowed up in life, and where in the very burden of suffering is revealed a “far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory,” and where the fellowship of the one opens the way for the participation of the other,—it is just this infinite peace breathed from the hallowed cross upon a dying world that out of shame it may rise to honor and exaltation and rest in God,—it is just this, the precious birthright of the Christian soul, which constitutes the new ideal which penetrated the whole development of modern painting and gave to it that

---

\* See former quotation from Oranam.

depth of content, that elevation and vigor and spirituality of expression which made it so far superior to all that preceded it in the ancient world.

---

The phantasy may be said to reach its highest activity in poetry. Here its creative power has the broadest sweep, and can give expression to the ideal in its fullest and most universal characteristics; for the form now is as it were unconfined by material, being wrought out from spiritual images within the mind itself. Dramatic, and epic, and lyric poetry, both in the material and in the inspiration under which the phantasy acts in its constructive work, cannot but be most fundamentally conditioned by the new creation of Christianity, and the far-reaching vision of faith. We have already referred to the lyric poetry of the church as assuming new form under the moulding power of the new spirit interfusing it. Poetry of this kind, however, in a far wider sense than meets us in the hymn which is confined to the service of the church, has felt the power of the new inspiration of Christian faith. The sufferings of life as well as its joys, indeed the whole inner world of soul-sensibility has gained a new significance through the revelation of Christ. The very deepest agitations of grief and pain, which seem to oppose the idea of beauty, are so made to reach into peace and triumph through Christian hope as to make the elegiac lyric beautiful, because fate is not victorious, but the soul; for from the profoundest depths of sorrow, from the saddest minor strains of grief, there rises up from within a major chord which at last overwhelms all pain, breaks through all despondency, and sounds forth in triumph, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us."

No true lyric poem, while giving utterance to the emotional soul, can be said to reach its end without bringing into view the deepest pathos of which the soul is capable; and this is only possible as the poet seizes upon the most profound and

most universal impulses which enter into the religious belief and hope and imagination of a people. These impulses come from Christianity. Its faith, and hope and charity constitute the very essence of the ideal here, and without this the agitated soul can find no point of repose, can reach no harmony out of dissonance, which lyric art for its proper completion demands. Whether consciously or unconsciously, so far as the poet's mind is concerned, the spirit of Christianity underlies and penetrates the pathos of the world. "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now \* \* \* waiting for the adoption, to wit the redemption of our body." Even in heathenism, there must be a dim foreshadowing of this to harmonize and reconcile the otherwise discordant awfulness of suffering and death. Sophocles felt this, and Antigone, whose pathetic cries are heard in the close of his great tragedy, cannot go down to the tomb, her bridal chamber, without cherishing firm hope of meeting her father, and mother, and brother. (Antigone, 891-900.) In Christianity, however, life and immortality are brought to light, and faith in the resurrection forms the deepest, the mightiest, and the most exalting impulse that can enter and touch the sensibilities of the human soul. No lyric composition, we repeat, which would disclose the fulness of soul-experience in way of art, can, without this, reach its blossoming perfection or gain any ultimate principle of unity and hence any proper interrelation of parts.

The *Lycidas* of Milton forms a most fitting illustration of our meaning here. This lyric mourns the loss of a dear friend drowned in the Irish seas. From verse to verse it sinks deeper and deeper into the profound darkness of grief. The sense of loss keeps enlarging itself by clinging in vain to the associations and reminiscences of an intercourse now forever broken. Sorrow keeps recoiling back upon itself as image after image passes before the phantasy in the vain effort for relief. At last the final struggle to reach comfort by dallying with false surmise, and bidding the valleys low to throw hither all their quaint enamell'd eyes, and strow with every flower that sad embroidery wears the laureate herse where Lycid lies, only makes

the gloom more appalling as it recalls the terrible reality that his bones are washed away by sounding seas and hurled beyond the stormy Hebrides; yet here in the very depths of agony comes the conquering transition, weep no more, for Lycidas your sorrow is not dead. Sunk though he be beneath the watery floor, yet has he mounted high through the dear might of Him that walked the waves

“And hears the unexpressive nuptial song,  
In the blest kingdoms meek of joy and love.”

Such is the lyric blossoming of sorrow when the Christian ideal has possession of the phantasy, and thus the poet, under the inspiration of faith, touches

“ \* \* the tender stops of various quills  
With eager thought warbling his Doric lay.”

Time does not allow us to continue our remarks in this direction any further. We cannot conclude thus abruptly, however, without venturing a brief statement in regard to the ultimate office of the phantasy as a legitimate and indestructible activity of the human spirit. The completion of our human life in the resurrection and exaltation into heaven is certainly not the annihilation of it as developed and active here. No doubt it is difficult to form any adequate conception of what is involved in the second advent of Christ, and the close of the present æon of history: and the same difficulty surrounds every effort to grasp the form in which the activities of our rational being will then be exercised. This much however may be safely said, we think, viz., that the relation of the second advent of Christ to the first must be most intimate and organic, or, in other words, that the second advent, which is clothed with such mysterious symbols when referred to in the Scriptures, cannot be an abrupt revelation disconnected from the one under which the church has moved onward in history. It must mark in some form the full apprehension upon the part of the Church of the mystery of Christ already apprehending it through the Spirit. It is the marriage of bride and bridegroom, and the wife hath



made herself ready. It is the blossom in one sense of an antecedent revelation of grace without which it would fail to have any moral significance for man. St. Paul says, "Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." The advent of Christ in glory must be something more than a mere theophany or outward sign-revelation coming in as a last resort to convince the world by a new style of evidence from beyond that of the Spirit. The Spirit shall glorify Me: for He shall receive of Mine, and shall show it unto you. The original revelation of Christ was not reached through flesh and blood. The apostolic vision which grasped the mystery was not carnal. So here Christ's coming in glory, His last and full epiphany, must be in its deepest essence an inner glorification of Christ in the apprehension of His saints, the fulness of spiritual intuition "When He shall come to be glorified in His saints, and to be admired in all them that believe." Such apprehension involves of course the glorification of His saints at the same time. They will then know as they are known.

Now this glorification will be not only in the grasp or apprehension of thought and in the activities of the will, but in *embodiment* also. In this embodiment, this outerness of inward spiritual glory, this spiritual body, this resurrection in which the full revelation of judgment will show itself as unto life eternal on the one hand, and unto condemnation on the other, we have what may be denominated the realm of perfected and glorified phantasy. Toward this the whole process here has looked and directed itself. Of the three forms through which, in the moral constitution of our life, the idea is brought to pass, by understanding and will and phantasy, neither one nor another will preponderate. They will not be mutually exclusive, but melt and flow together into a spiritual beatific vision, in which being and knowing and æsthetic seeing will be conjoined, mutually commensurate and one; and that which is in part, shall be done away.

## ART. II.—THE BASIS OF UNION.

BY AN ANGLICAN CATHOLIC.\*

IN an Article by the Rev. Dr. Nevin, reviewing Bishop Coxe's "Apollos," exception was taken to the views expressed in a newspaper notice of the same book. A good deal of space was devoted to this notice. It was in fact quoted almost entire, and was as elaborately reviewed as its merits demanded. It was pronounced to be a "characteristically Episcopalian passage," "full of intolerant bitterness and bad humor," pervaded by an "air of lordliness," &c., &c. Concerning which the author of the newspaper notice in question desires to say, that he does not look upon criticisms of this nature as arguments, and trusts that in making no reply to them, he will not be understood either as acknowledging the justice of them, or as treating Dr. Nevin with disrespect.

It is scarcely necessary to say that the single topic of Christian Union, was the one all-absorbing theme, of the Bishop's book, of Dr. Nevin's Review, and of the humbler newspaper Article. That men should differ on this subject, is to be expected. That all parties should at the last, come to mutual concession, is doubtless the fervent desire of good men; that the subject may be discussed without stirring up and embittering feeling, is perhaps possible. Certainly if this cannot be done, no greater proof could be given that we all need to remember from whence we are fallen, and to repent and do our first works. At any rate it is important that we should understand each other. And to this end it must be acknowledged that an interchange of views is necessary.

When we consider how greatly theological terms change their

---

\* It may be proper to state that the writer is an Episcopal clergyman.—*Ed. Rev.*

meaning in the minds of all those who adopt some new system, we can readily understand how misconceptions arise, and how men of pure motives, and with ability, and even learning, come to look upon one another as holding monstrous opinions. The change that has passed upon the meaning of but two words, has been the cause of more misunderstanding and recrimination, than it is possible to estimate. These words are the terms "*Regeneration*" and "*Catholic*." In the first ages of Christianity, *Regeneration* was used as the synonym of *Baptism*; the word "*Catholic*" was invariably used as a title of distinction, to designate the Church in opposition to other denominations, which at that time were called by the hard name of *heretics*. Now, it has come to pass that *regeneration* is used to describe what must in the case of infants, take place after Baptism, and in the case of adults, before Baptism. Whilst the term *Catholic* is used not to distinguish the Church from other denominations, but as a non-distinguishing term to embrace all. The result of this is, that a Churchman, who still adheres to the old and historic meaning of the words, understands them, of course, in the historic sense, while people of other denominations using them with the new meaning, totally misapprehend what the Churchman would be at, and attribute to him views that he does not entertain, and can with difficulty even understand.

The term "*Christian Union*" has had a fate similar to that of the words above mentioned. The Churchman understands by it, what St. Cyprian expressed by the phrase "unity of the Church." Knowing full well what the bond of this unity was, and how in all ages of the Church, it has been looked upon, the Churchman without more ado, attributes the same meaning, only to find that with other people, "*Christian Union*" does not mean "*Unity of the Church*;" that the bond of Christian union is not the Episcopate as in St. Cyprian's time; but that Christian union means the Evangelical Alliance, and the bond of Union means certain dogmas formulated in Freemasons' Hall, London, in the year of our Lord 1846.

Here is a difficulty at the outset; it is almost impossible to

come at a mutual understanding. Words are used which in the mouth of the speaker mean one thing, and in the mind of the hearer mean another thing. Surely this ought not to be so. Christianity has been in the world 1800 years. It has a history. Its terms have historic meanings. They have come down to us as heir-looms of the past. We ought not to be guilty of a hide and seek game in the use of words. We have no right to change that which we have received from the past, and hold in trust for the future. Let us say what we mean. And let us not mean something different from what we say. If we desire to express what is novel, let us not hesitate to assume all the responsibility, and manfully and boldly say so. But let us not take old and time-honored terms, that have come down to us from antiquity, freighted with one meaning and use them in some new and strange sense, thus rendering unavoidable much misunderstanding, alienation and distrust.

As a fair illustration of the new ideas, on the subject of Christian Union, the doings of the late Evangelical Alliance may be cited. Organized, as the Rev. James Davis, British secretary of the Alliance says: "to consolidate and complete efforts which had been made in previous years, to associate Christians of all countries, in a *cordial, visible and effective union*," it ended by declaring that organic union is not possible nor desirable, and that the present condition of having different denominations, characterized by mutual respect and goodwill, was in fact a condition of union, and all the union that could be hoped for. The Rev. Dr. Hodge, professor of Theology at Princeton, N. J., made an address that was frequently applauded in the course of its delivery, in which he said: "But on account of the imperfection of our knowledge, and such diversity of opinion between believers, *it is impossible* that all Christians should be united in the same organization. *It is better therefore*, that they should separate and constitute different denominational churches, than that there should be one heaving conflicting mass of men, and not a church." Further on in his address Dr. Hodge says: "I know that there is a theory of the Church very different from this. It makes the

form everything; but if nothing external be essential for a man to be a Christian, then nothing external is essential to the being of a Church." Other speakers uttered like sentiments. No action of the Alliance however was taken formally, adopting any such utterance. But the expressions were so decided, and the speakers so many and eminent, and the applause so frequent and hearty, as to show that the prevailing opinion was as we have described it. Other speakers, on the day devoted to Christian Union, expressed themselves as pointedly as the Rev. Dr. Hodge. But we have quoted from his speech for the reason, that we suppose, no man belonging to any of the denominations represented in the Alliance, will call in question his pre-eminent fitness as a representative speaker.

The Rev. Dr. Nevin has taken us to task, for saying that "the prevailing opinion in the Alliance was, that corporate union was neither possible nor desirable, but that a union in spirit and in aim, was all that in any case ought to be attempted, and that this already existed to a satisfactory degree." He says the Alliance met "*not to discuss a plan of union, and still less, to stultify themselves by declaring no farther union necessary or desirable.*" The Rev. James Davis, British secretary, says, that its object was to "*associate Christians of all countries in a cordial, visible and effective union.*" Whilst the Rev. Dr. Hodge says, that "*it is impossible that all Christians should be united in the same organization.*" It would seem to be a much easier task to reconcile these statements with what we have said above, than to reconcile them with what the Rev. Dr. Nevin says. We have however no doubt, whatever, that Dr. Nevin has a theory in his own mind, by which his views of the Evangelical Alliance find their justification. But we trust that he will be able to see, that to an outsider, our view of it would seem to be unavoidable. And the whole thing serves to illustrate what we said before, that men associated in the acceptance of peculiar religious views, do come to use language in a sense different from the rest of the world. That they are almost certain to be misunderstood by others, and are themselves also incapable of understanding others.

We have studied with care, the speeches and addresses made in the Evangelical Alliance on the day devoted to Christian Union, and we find it impossible to extract any other meaning from them than what we expressed before, that "the *prevailing opinion* was that corporate union, was neither possible nor desirable, but that a union in spirit, and in aim was all that in any case ought to be attempted, and that this already existed to a satisfactory degree." Now it gives us no satisfaction to form this opinion, but rather pain. We had hoped that an association of good men, from the leading Protestant denominations brought together, according to the statement of one of their own officers, "to consolidate and complete efforts—to associate Christians of all countries in a *cordial, visible and effective union*," would not have declared to the world that "*it is impossible that all Christians should be united in the same organization.*" If they had said, that it is impossible now, and had bewailed the fact instead of glorying in it, and declaring that it was just what ought to be, and nothing else was to be desired, then we would have entertained hope, that the great day of the marriage supper of the Lamb was about to burst upon the world. That there were men in the Evangelical Alliance who did not share in the prevailing opinion, nor join in the applause called out by Dr. Hodge's address, we can well believe; that there was *one* such we are convinced. That one was the Rev. Dr. Nevin. *He* says: that they met "to confess before the world, and to one another the sad wrong of their divisions, and to do what in them might lie, through such testimony and confession, and mutual brotherly provocation in love, to stir up in themselves and in others, the full measure of zeal that is required to do away with the sectarian evil, through earnest consultation and study of the things that make for unity and peace." To this statement, regarded as an abstract opinion, there is no objection to be urged. But in the face of the testimony before adduced, we cannot believe that it was the prevailing sentiment in the Evangelical Alliance. The Rev. Dr. Nevin who was there, we acknowledge, ought to know better than we who were not there. But then there is the

language of the speakers, which we do not see how to interpret in a sense which the words do not legitimately bear. But as we said before, it is always possible to be mistaken. New Theology puts new meaning upon old terms, and we know what the result is when new wine is put into old bottles.

But there is one thing upon which we suppose all will agree, and that is, that whatever the ideas of Christian Union in the Evangelical Alliance were or were not, there is one thing that they *certainly* were not. And that is the old idea, that the Episcopate is the bond of union appointed by the Lord, and transmitted by succession from the Apostles. It would seem that the best way of arriving at true views of unity, would be to go back to that period of the Church's history, when she was united, and to ascertain if possible, what was at that time looked upon as the bond of union. To what did the primitive Church owe its unity? Or to what did it suppose that it owed it? The answer to this question is plain. It is not probable that Dr. Nevins will deny that this bond of union, was thought by the primitive Christians to be the Episcopate. That by this the Church in all the world was held together, not only the different parts to each other, *but the entire Church to the past.*

It is forgotten in these times, that mere existence in any one age of the world without divisions, is not Christian Union in the historic sense. That is, it does not constitute the "Unity of the Church." Any *Christian Union* that comes short of "*Unity of the Church,*" is not union at all, but schism. It is possible to be united *in* schism. It would by no means follow, that if all the Protestant denominations in the world, were united under one form of Church government, there would be Church unity. It might be a worse schism than ever, and infinitely more dangerous, because of the very consolidation. Christian unity implies not organic union alone, but *such* an organic union as shall make the Church one with the Church of the past. No matter how closely welded or how great the peace and harmony, the union which shall not make the Church one with the past, identical with the body which the Apostles planted in all the world, will be no union at all, but a



deplorable schism. This is all important, because it is not understood. The meaning of the very term unity itself, has been changed. Eminent doctors of Divinity, who can by no possibility be ignorant of the historic meaning of the term, continually use it in the new sense, without ever giving to their co-religionists an intimation of the true meaning, and keeping them in ignorance of what was held in the entire Christian world for fifteen hundred years, and is by three-fourths of it to-day held to be the true and only meaning of the term unity. The amount of testimony to the fact, that the Primitive Church held that the Episcopate was the bond of unity, that tied them to one another and to the Apostles, is so overwhelming, that in the vain attempt to elude it, modern teachers are compelled to accuse the Church of Christ, of having borne false witness in her very infancy, upon a matter of such vital importance, that the peace of Christendom and the conversion of the world to-day depend upon it.

Inasmuch as St. Cyprian has been quoted by the Rev. Dr. Nevins, in his review of "*Apollos: or the Way of God*," we take it for granted, that he is a witness whose testimony the doctor looks upon as reliable. In this we perfectly agree with him. For the Age of St. Cyprian, as Archbishop Sage in his work on the "*Cyprianic Age*" shows, was most favorably circumstanced for exhibiting to us in its primitive perfection, the order of the Church. He says: "It was an age in which secular governments had not yet shown any tokens of favor, any expressions of kindness, to those who professed the Christian principles; much less had they imparted anything of temporal greatness, or given any secular encouragements to the governors of Christian Churches. It was an age which, as much as any before it, had all the humiliation, and all the purification, all the admonition, and all the correction, and all the sharp discipline, and all the solid refinement, which persecutions, both violent and frequent, could give it—an age very far from being apt to cherish ambition, or the affectation of any undue or unwarrantable heights in professors of Christianity—an age in which the being an eminent governor of the Church was the

exposing of the person, whoever he was, to the first brunt of the fiery trial—an age, indeed, liable to none of the popular objections commonly mustered up against some following ages—an age on which it could not be charged, that either the favor of princes, or the abundance of riches, or the pomps of the world, or the privileges and immunities of ecclesiastics, or anything of that nature hath corrupted it.” Bishop Sage goes on to show “that it was an age of much ecclesiastical business; none after the Apostles had more.” “That it was an age of great men.” “It was an age that was in a manner singular for this advantage, that it had transmitted to posterity many excellent records, many synodical epistles and forms, and constitutions.” “That the extraordinary manifestations and communications of the Divine Spirit had not then ceased, but continued in very great plenty.” And last of all he says “that those of the Cyprianic Age, were not so far removed from the times of the Apostles, but they might have been very well acquainted with the state of Government, in which the apostles left the Churches, before they left the world.”

It is pleasing to observe that the Rev. Dr. Nevin yields the point that St. Cyprian *was* a Bishop, and not simply the moderator of a Presbytery, as the Presbyterians of Bishop Sage's time claimed. Two hundred years have wrought this change. Perhaps in less than two hundred years more, the Presbyterians may be willing to acknowledge not only that St. Cyprian was a Bishop, but that he was such by Divine right.

The schisms and controversies of St. Cyprian's time, were such as to bring out into full view, and strongly emphasize all the features of the Church's Polity and Order; especially were they such as to place in the clearest light, what the church at that time held on the subject of Christian Union, or Unity of the Church. In his fifty-fifth Epistle, St. Cyprian writing to Antonianus says: “As regards the character of Novatian, dearest brother, of whom you have desired word should be written you, what heresy he had introduced; you should know in the first place, that we ought not even to be curious as to what he teaches, since he teaches without the Church. Who-

soever he be, and whatsoever he be, he is not a Christian, who is not in the Church of Christ. Although he may boast himself, and in lofty words proclaim his own philosophy or eloquence, he who has retained neither brotherly love nor ecclesiastical unity, has lost even what he had before. Unless he seem to you to be a Bishop, who when a Bishop has been made in the Church by sixteen fellow-Bishops, endeavors by intrigue to be by deserters made an adulterous and strange Bishop: and whereas, *there is one Church from Christ throughout the whole world*, divided into many members, and *one Episcopate diffused throughout an harmonious multitude of many Bishops*, he notwithstanding the tradition of God, notwithstanding the unity of the Catholic Church, everywhere compacted and joined together, *attempts to make a human Church*, and sends his apostles through very many cities, that he may establish certain recent foundations of his own institution." Further on, in the same section he says: "But he could not hold the Episcopate, even had he been made Bishop first, since he has fallen away from the body of his fellow-Bishops, and from the unity of the Church."

We gather from this, what was Cyprian's teaching on the subject of the unity of the Church. In fact his famous solidarity of the Episcopate, is nothing more nor less than a declaration of the true basis of Church union. In his thirty-third Epistle he says: "Our Lord, whose precepts and warnings we ought to observe, determining the honor of a Bishop and the ordering of His own Church, speaks in the Gospel and says to Peter, *I say unto thee, that thou art Peter, &c.* Thence the ordination of Bishops, and the ordering of the Church, *was down along the course of time, and line of succession, so that the Church is settled upon her Bishops*; and every act of the Church is regulated by these same Prelates." Here we learn that the Unity of the Church covers time as well as space. That unless it be united by the succession to the Apostles there is no Unity, and that the bond of this union both in time and space, is the Episcopate. In his forty-fifth Epistle, the same idea is again expressed. Addressing Cornelius he says: "For

this, brother, very especially we both do and ought to labor ; that we strive to hold fast, as much as we can, *the unity appointed by the Lord, and through the Apostles delivered to us* their successors, and, as much as in us lies, that we gather unto the Church the straying and wandering sheep, which the forward faction of some, and the temptation of heresy, separate from their mother ; leaving those only to remain without, who persist in their obstinacy or madness, and will not return to us ; who will hereafter have to give account to the Lord, of the division and separation they have caused, and of their abandonment of the Church." In his sixty-ninth Epistle addressed to Magnus, he says : " This the Apostle Paul explains, teaching and charging that a heretic should be avoided, as perverse, and a sinner and condemned of himself. For he will be guilty of his own destruction, who not being cast out by the Bishop, is of his own accord a renegade from the Church, through heretical presumption condemned of himself. And therefore the Lord, intimating to us that *unity cometh of Divine authority*, declareth and saith, I and my Father are one. To which unity bringing His Church, He further saith, There shall be one fold and one shepherd. But if there is one flock, how can he be numbered as of the flock, who is not in the number of the flock ? Or how be accounted a shepherd, who, the true shepherd remaining and by successive ordination presiding in the Church of God, himself, succeeding to no one, and beginning from himself, becomes an alien and profane, an enemy to the Lord's peace and to the Divine Unity ?"

This conception of unity was not the private speculation of St. Cyprian ; it was the accepted view of the entire Church, both of that and the preceding ages ; as any one may see, who chooses to read Tertullian's "*De Præscriptione Hæreticorum*," St. Irenæus' "*Contra Hæreses*," the genuine Epistles of St. Ignatius, and in fact any author of the Primitive Church, for when the idea is not expressly set forth, it is impliedly contained. Even the famous passage in St. Jerome, of which the opponents of Episcopacy have attempted to make so much, does, when properly understood in the light of the events then exciting interest, but make against them.

The Cyprianic expression "solidarity of the Episcopate," has been interpreted in a new sense by Dr. Nevin. But there is one principle of interpretation that he sets at defiance. And that is this: of two or more possible interpretations of a passage, or of a doctrine, we should choose that one, which prevailed at or nearest the time when the passage was penned, or the doctrine was enunciated. If we apply this principle to Dr. Nevin's interpretation of the Catholic doctrine of the solidarity, it disposes of it at once. If we understand him, the validity of Episcopal acts depends upon the preservation of intercommunion. Because the Anglican Church, since the Reformation has been out of communion with the Latin Church, therefore the succession of her Bishops is destroyed, and their acts invalid. But that this was not the meaning of St. Cyprian and the primitive Church, is shown by the fact that the Bishops of the African Church, including Cyprian himself, continued to discharge their Episcopal functions during the time that communion was broken off between that Church, and the Church of Rome. Where was the solidarity of the Episcopate at that time, if Dr. Nevin's view be correct? It is clear that if St. Cyprian had held the view which Dr. Nevin attributes to him, he would not have dared to perform Episcopal acts during the time that the African Church thus stood alone. But St. Cyprian did not hold this view; and it is equally certain, that St. Augustine did not; for during the time of the difficulty, that the African Church had with Zozimus, Bishop of Rome, in the Pelagian controversy Augustine and the other African Bishops, did not behave as if they thought they would be in the slightest degree, endangered by a separation from the European Church.

It has never been held in the Church, that a cessation of intercommunion can invalidate orders. There are but two ways of losing the grace of orders. One is to voluntarily abandon the Church; and the other is to be canonically deposed. The Church of England so far from voluntarily abandoning the Catholic Church, based her right to reform herself upon the very fact, that she *was the Catholic Church* of that country;

and rejected the supremacy of the Pope, and the corruptions that came in by means of his party, because they were all non-catholic abuses, and schismatical in their nature. Communion was broken off in the year 1569, the eleventh of Elizabeth, by the act of Pope Pius V, who presumed to excommunicate Queen Elizabeth and her adherents. This excommunication was invalid for two reasons. First: it was done without trial and for an alleged political offense. Second: Pope Pius V. who fulminated it, had no jurisdiction in the case. It is therefore clear that if any persons were cut off from the Catholic Church by this operation, it was not the Church of England, but the Pope and his party. For he who illegally excommunicates another, doth but himself be guilty of a schismatical act. The standing of the other party is in no wise affected.

There is however a Catholic Truth, contained in this objection of the Rev. Dr. Nevin, if it be only rightly understood and applied. *It is true, that in an adjudicated case, by a competent tribunal*, any national Church being separated from the communion of the remainder of the Church in the world, would be outside of the Catholic Church, and would lose the grace of orders. That is, according to Dr. Nevin's idea, they would no longer be partakers of the solidarity of the Episcopate. The succession would be imperilled, and could not, to put it on the lowest ground, transmit *mission*, that is, authority to exercise the duties of the ministry. The only tribunal competent to excommunicate a National Church, is a General Council, that is a representation of all the National Churches in the world, whose decrees shall subsequently be ratified by all the churches in the world, except the one whose case was tried. But there has not been a General Council of the Church, since the third of Constantinople, or the sixth Ecumenical, assembled by the Emperor Constantine Pogonatus, A. D. 680. The subsequent so-called General Councils, were not such, not possessing even one characteristic entitling them to the name.

The Reformers of the sixteenth century both in Great Britain and on the Continent appealed to a General Council. All their work was provisional, and is such to this day. If the

Council of Trent had been in reality what it claimed to be, that is, if it had contained free representatives of all the national churches in the world, who can doubt, that instead of the Decrees and Canons that were passed, the Papacy itself would have been arraigned and stripped of all its pretensions? The work of reform would have been general throughout the whole world, and would have been carried on in the bosom of the Church. The melancholy results that followed would not have followed. The Elective Affinity organizations, Lutheran, Reformed, and Calvinistic, would not have perpetuated their existence; and above all, the Roman Catholic Church, which was brought into being at that Council, would have not been able to come to the birth.

It was only because of the impossibility of such a Council that the Reformers felt justified in going on with their work, in the imperfect manner in which it was accomplished, making provisional arrangements, which might continue until such time as a General Council might be assembled. The whole case is therefore now *sub judice*; the appeal has been taken; matters must therefore stand *in statu quo*. Whatever authority the Church of England had before the Reformation, it will continue to have until the point is decided between the litigants. Which decision can only be by a General Council.

Some curious results follow from this view of the case. All Protestant Christendom stands pledged to maintain the work as the Reformers left it, until the next General Council shall assemble. The various Church organizations which they made, *were not meant to be permanent*. They were designed merely as provisional regulations. As such they must be maintained. Whoever remains in any of these provisional organizations longer than necessary, or strives to make them permanent, departs from the faith of the Reformers. They were originated in the first place, on the plea of necessity, that is because the Church itself refused to be reformed. But when the Church becomes reformed the necessity ceases. Longer continuance becomes voluntary schism. Now that Reformation has begun in the National Churches of Europe, those who will keep faith



with the Reformers of the sixteenth century, must re-enter the Church. If they do not, they depart from the faith of the Reformation.

In this country we are in an anomalous condition. At the time of the Reformation there was nothing but a heathen population here. This population was not converted to Christianity. It was exterminated. Europeans have settled the Continent. They have brought with them every variety and form of religion, and they have originated some new forms here. The Anglican Communion among others is in the land. It is the only Reformed Branch of the Catholic Church that has any foothold here. It retains the ancient order of the Church, but has many things too distinctively Anglican to render the Church as at present constituted altogether acceptable to the vast and heterogeneous population of this country. The so-called "Episcopal Church" does not hold, that as at present constituted it is the Ark, into which all others as repentant truants must come. What this church holds is: "That she has in trust the Apostolic order of the Ancient Catholic Church, which she holds herself in readiness to impart to the Christians of this land as soon as they show a disposition to abandon the Sectarian and Elective Affinity principle, and are willing to go in with her and constitute a truly national American and Catholic Church, not requiring them to accept anything in her that is distinctively and purely Anglican, but only such things as are Catholic." To this end she is willing to concede fully as much as she asks them to concede, which is everything that is not Catholic. She does not desire to have imposed upon her the national features of other countries, neither does she desire to impose hers upon others. But, in the meantime, as long as the objection which others make against her, is not against the things that are Anglican, but against the things that are Catholic, that is her Ancient and Apostolic Order, she does not feel called upon to make the changes and concessions which otherwise she would be willing to make, for the purpose of winning those who refuse upon any terms to be won.

Changes, which can be wisely made only when the exigency comes about that shall render them necessary. If now, in order to please, we were to renounce what we hold to be catholic and vital principles, what would they or we gain? The ministers of other denominations would gain the right of officiating in our churches, in the celebration of a service that would embarrass them at every step, and which they could not render devotionally without greater familiarity than can be had in any way, except by constant use. And we would gain the privilege of officiating in their churches in a service, which can never be anything but distasteful to the great majority of those who are accustomed to our service. Such a concession would not heal any existing schism, would accomplish no end, and serve no purpose; whilst we would have forfeited the only reason that we can give to God or man for our existence as a separate religious organization. If there were the least disposition shown to unite all existing religious organizations into one, the case would be vastly different. Then we would ourselves, either gladly make, or joyfully entertain overtures looking to the establishment of one great National and Catholic Church in America, and would consider ourselves highly privileged before God and the world, to cast aside everything of a non-catholic nature that could stand in the way of people really desirous of bringing about so desirable a consummation.

If it be possible to utter a disagreeable truth without giving offence, we desire to do so now. In what we are about to say, we tread on tender ground. But if ever Christians are to understand one another and bring about the unification of Christendom, these unwelcome words must be spoken. And we by way of showing that we mean to deal fairly, promise that we shall not shrink from having the like words spoken to us, and if spoken in love, to give them affectionate and candid consideration.

However, in introducing the subject, we feel that we are not taking the initiative. Nor would we feel warranted in referring to it at all, if the Rev. Dr. Nevin had not already brought it forward. The subject to which we refer is the very disagreeable charge so frequently made against the Anglican Com-

munion, of Romanizing tendencies. These charges have been prominently urged for three hundred years. And we are perhaps not far out of the way when we say, that the nine-tenths of Protestants outside of the Anglican Communion seriously believe them to be true. As calm and dispassionate a statement of it as we have ever seen is contained in the Rev. Dr. Nevin's review of "Apollos." He says: "The mechanism of the Papacy in such view is not what the sick world needs to make it well; but neither is it any more than this, the high-church mechanism of Episcopacy by divine right—a mechanism, *which can come to its full sense and right end at last, unquestionably, only in the Roman idea of a JURE DIVINO infallible centre.*" This passage might be placed in contrast with another on page 15, Jan. Num. of this Review, wherein speaking of this same system it is said that many "outside of the Episcopal Communion," "who see and deplore the present evil condition of things," "*would be glad to take refuge in it, if it could show itself truly equal to the task of the times.*" The inconsistency of these two statements is, of course, apparent; and we refer to it not in any way of supposed triumph at having detected the author of them in an inconsistency, for the inconsistency is one not at all uncommon in writers of the very first ability and of unimpeached integrity, but is of such a nature as proves that a man's generous impulses are frequently found at war with the exigencies of his own logic. We are glad therefore to repeat that it gives us pleasure to find this old objection stated without an undue measure of the *odium theologicum*. And we take this opportunity of saying, what may be a surprise to some, that the ablest theologians of the Anglican Communion entertain the settled conviction, not only, that in making this charge, men of other denominations mistake what is Catholic for what is Papal, but also *are themselves in the very error which they endeavor to fix upon us*. That is, that the principle upon which all the Denominations are based, is the very theory of the Papacy itself; one which it first taught the world; and which was invented for the express purpose of strengthening the Papal dogma of the Supremacy of the Pope.

Before the Reformation, the school-men, by way of establishing the dogma of the Papal supremacy on a theological basis, taught that the Episcopate was not a separate and distinct order of the ministry, but was in fact only a grade of the priesthood; and that the Pope, who was the Bishop over the whole Church, or universal Bishop, delegated to this order of the priesthood certain Episcopal functions, because of the physical impossibility of his being everywhere present to perform those functions himself. The ordinal, however, was not changed so as to conform with this view; but the view itself was dogmatically taught. The discussions in the Council of Trent upon this point were long and bitter. As every one knows, the history of that Council is nothing else but the record of the intrigues of the Jesuits, and the Papal party, in order, one way and another, to circumvent and overthrow the will of the assembled Bishops; and in every case when a vote was not actually reached, the Jesuits have since assumed their meaning to be the will of the Council. In the discussion of the Papal supremacy the majority of the Bishops maintained that the Episcopate was a divine order, in which every Bishop received his authority directly from God. The Romans and Spaniards in the Council opposed this view, and as a forlorn hope, Lainez,\* the General of the Order of the Jesuits, made a speech, in which he maintained a modified form of the doctrine that the Episcopacy was not a separate order of Divine right, but was only a degree of the priesthood, and that the Episcopal authority was only ecclesiastical, and derived from the Pope. The Council never came to a vote on the question; but every one acquainted with the subject knows that ever since the

---

\* Lainez did not in his speech take the full ground afterward maintained by the Jesuits, for the Council would not bear it. What he did say was, that whilst the Episcopate itself was divinely established in subordination to the Pope, individual Bishops were completely at his mercy. For this reason we have said that he set forth the doctrine in a modified form. But afterward when the Jesuits got control of the Roman Church they taught their doctrine in full, as it had been maintained by Durandus, that "all Bishops are derived from the Pope, as members from the head, and all they receive of his fulness." See Bishop Jewell's "Defence of the Apology of the Church of England," vol. iv. page 829, Edition of the Parker Society.

Council of Trent the influence of the Roman party has been predominant. That at length the Jesuits have got the control of the Church into their hands, and all that they desired to accomplish by means of the Council of Trent, has at length been brought about through their ascendancy. As proof of this, the Catechism of the Council of Trent nominally compiled from the decrees of the Council, teaches on the subject of the Episcopate, not the belief of the majority of the Bishops that composed that Council, but inculcates, in a debased form, the teaching of Lainez, the General of the Order of the Jesuits. In part II. chap. vii., question xxv., it dogmatizes as follows: "Although there is but one order of the priesthood, it must not be inferred for this reason that there is but one grade of priests. For this order although it be but single, has nevertheless various grades of dignity and power. The first of these grades is of those who are called simply priests, whose functions have heretofore been declared. The second of these grades is that of Bishops, who are established in their several jurisdictions, that they may rule not only the other ministers of the Church, but also the believing multitude, and look after their salvation with the highest watchfulness and care."

Opposed to this stands the doctrine of the Anglican Communion that there are not three grades, but *three orders* of the Holy ministry. In the preface to the ordinal it is stated as follows: "It is evident unto all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been *these three Orders* of Ministers in Christ's Church,—Bishops, Priests, and Deacons." The very point of dispute between the Anglican Communion and the Church of the Vatican is whether or not the Episcopate is a separate order existing by divine right, or is nothing but an ecclesiastical grade of the presbyterate? This question, as we have seen, was sharply discussed in the Council of Trent, and we are indebted to that mighty champion of parity, Lainez, the General-in-Chief of the Order of Jesuits, for the fact that the Church of the Vatican stands committed to-day to the same views of the Episcopate that prevail among all Non-catholic and Protestant denominations.

So far therefore from the Anglican doctrine of "Episcopacy by Divine right finding its full sense and right end at last in the Roman idea of a *jure divino* infallible centre;" it is the only idea that can make headway against the dogma of papal supremacy. In the Council of Trent those who opposed the *jure divino* theory of the Papacy, maintained the *jure divino* theory of Episcopacy. Whilst those who held to the *jure divino* papacy opposed the *jure divino* Episcopacy. It is instructive to observe also, that the believers in Episcopacy as of Divine right, were also champions of the ancient Catholic idea of the independence of National Churches. Whilst the Roman and Spanish parties under the lead of the Jesuits, maintained the modern idea of a *Roman* Catholic Church, swallowing up all National Churches, and closely organized throughout the whole world, under the supreme control of the Roman Curia.

It is a noted fact also that the Romish Church to-day fears the Church of England as its worse enemy. Every means fair and foul have been resorted to, to bring her into disrepute. Their favorite device, in order to secure the hearty co-operation of dissenters, is to claim that she is like Rome; and in the face of history, to assert that the doctrine of Episcopacy as of Divine right, is a Romanizing tenet. They do this because they hate the doctrine, and desire to have it hated of all men—knowing well that dissenters always hate a thing if it only can have the name of Roman fixed upon it.

In view of these historic facts, I ask the question, what system favors Romanism? And what system opposes it? Let any one read the history of the Council of Trent and answer. Could any denomination ever have come into existence except upon the basis of this dogma of the Jesuits, that Episcopacy does not exist by Divine right? If this doctrine were rejected to-day would not all the Christians in the world immediately be brought into subjection to the Episcopate? Certainly they would. This dogma is the one cause of Christian division in Western Christendom. And its collateral the doctrine of the papal supremacy is all that maintains the schism of east and west or of Greek and Latin. The papacy is therefore the one

cause of the present divided state of Christendom. And all who are in schism, are where they are only by virtue of having adopted this papal dogma.

It is not on this question of Church order alone that sectarian Protestantism agrees with the papacy. Something might be said about the attempts made by both of them to explain the mystery of the Holy Eucharist. The one giving a material explanation and the other explaining it by denying all mystery, and all grace. Something might also be said under the head of public worship, wherein both these parties agree, although for different purposes, to take from the people the ancient responsive service which, in the Holy Communion at least, has come down from the very first ages of Christianity, but we forbear.

A very marked instance of fundamental agreement with Rome by one who differs from her widely is contained in Dr. Nevin's view of "*Apollos : or the Way of God.*" We quote the following passage: "What we mean is, that if either popery or episcopacy be essential to the being of the Christian Church, it must be under the view of their being in some way, along with their outward ordination, *a true concretion or outbirth from the inward life of the Church.* Any other view is becoming more intolerable for the self-consciousness of the age in which we live. The world has got beyond that notion of the obedience of faith, and can never more get back to it in its historical life, whether in Vatican or Laudean form." Here we have the Romish doctrine of development differently applied. Once grant the principle that anything affecting the Church's order so as to change it, may spring from the inward life of the Church, and what may not the apparent necessities of the times bring in? If outward ordination by the Apostles is insufficient, how much does it fall short of sufficiency? Is it necessary at all? The inward life of the Church may develop a cultus of the Virgin. Or it may develop the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, or of the Infallibility of the Pope. Who can gain-say it? These Papal corruptions have been the growth of centuries. They were the natural outgrowth of that system in



the circumstances in which it was placed, and under like conditions would occur again. It is vain to attempt to distinguish between the inner and the outer life. They are both one. *God always lodges life in an organism*, or rather the life is not a separate unity, but it is the organism that lives. The latest researches in Biology show this. And the works and ways of God are uniform. It is just here that the danger lies. Let there be something wrong in the organism, and in the end it will produce evils which no power of imagination can forecast. The life does not produce the organism. It is the organism that lives. Life always manifests itself through organism; when the organism is seriously impaired or changed, life departs, or the organism no longer lives. Man is a compound being made up of soul, body, and spirit; when these are combined, man is organized and lives; when they are separated he is disorganized and dies. His organism is then taken apart. Some of the component parts of this organism may live. The Scripture teaches us that some of them do live, but the *man* is dead. The *spirits* of the just are made perfect, but the just themselves, do not live again until the Resurrection of the dead.

Dr. Nevin's argument is the very one that Rome uses to justify all her assumptions. When we show that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was not held in the first ages, she replies, that it was held in *posse* but not in *esse*. That it was virtually held, but that the onward life of the Church developed it into consciousness. Dr. Nevin's theory is Rome's theory, and it is necessarily the common property of them both. It is not possible to give a logical account of modern sectarianism on any other theory than this; and it is just as impossible to account for the accretions of Roman dogmas without it.

This development theory is even more clearly announced by Dr. Nevin in another place. He says:

"It is a delusive vision—this dream of bringing all things right by an unhistorical pilgrimage of our whole modern Christendom to the tombs of the fathers, martyrs and confessors, who fell asleep in the Lord fifteen hundred years ago; this fond conceit of putting an end to all heresy and schism by setting

ourselves as Dr. Coxe phrases it 'to work back to the precise position in which the Churches would have continued, had the Papacy never disturbed the primitive constitutions.' God be praised, that the early Christian world was doomed to no such stagnation as that! And God forbid, that the Christian world now should try to work itself back to it by any such crab-like process."

Never before have we seen in any place by any Evangelical Christian so complete an acknowledgment that history and antiquity are both against the modern sectarian idea. No where have we seen so complete an abandonment of the Catholic idea of Christian union which binds us to the past as well as to one another. The appeal to history is a test which neither Rome nor Geneva can abide. But it is not common to see the whole case given up in this fashion, and everything rested upon development.

Christianity is either a Revelation or it is not. If it is a Revelation it was all revealed in the beginning. If it is not a Revelation, it is what man chooses to make it. If it is a Revelation and was revealed in the beginning, how shall we correct our mistakes, and reform abuses except by repenting and *doing our first works*? Formerly the plea of every religious denomination was that antiquity spoke its voice. The Baptists made antiquity Baptist. The Presbyterians made it Presbyterian. But now it seems that this plea is given up, and that they are to cut loose without rudder or chart, to be borne whither they know not, and to be engulfed in what strange seas they know not.

It seems to us that Dr. Nevin somewhat misunderstands the Bishop. He does not say that we are to work our way back to antiquity as it then was, but as it "*would have continued*" if the papacy had not arisen. The meaning of which is plain enough. Conditions change. The Church's Apostolic order was not meant for antiquity only, but for all time. Under varying conditions, its operations would vary. Just as it is with the human frame. Under the burning sun of Africa the skin blackens, the hair turns crisp, and the features and form

are moulded. Among the fair Scandinavians of the north, how different the modifications. But the organism is the same. The functions of all the organs are precisely the same, they all work in the same way. Yet how different the result. The human system has an endless power of adaptation without being itself structurally changed.

So is it with the Church; she has her three-fold ministry, her sacraments, and sacramental ordinances; the sacred Scriptures, her worship, and the grace of Christ ministered continually to her members. These are the component parts of her structure, and in these she lives; separate them and she dies. The organism lives while it is organized, when it becomes disorganized it dies. But under different conditions. In different countries and different climes, the color and hue of the godliness produced varies. The enterprises undertaken for the benefit of man and of the world vary. As circumstances call for it, she develops learning and culture, to combat polished error, or in times of pestilence and famine all her energies are swallowed up in ministering to the suffering. This brings into exercise and pushes out into relief different parts of her structure, making the outward appearance, as well as the inner feelings and emotions, and the scope and range of her activities to vary, but the organism is the same all the time, and the life is the same.

But let us return once more to the one great cause of all this schism for which mankind is seeking a cure. That is the papacy. If we read the prophecies aright this depressed state of the Church, this prophesying in sackcloth must continue, until the papacy be destroyed. Schism cannot cease while the cause remains. But when the cause shall be removed the results also will pass away. All that we can do now is to seek to understand our times, to prepare the way for better things, so that when that which letteth is taken out of the way—the grand work of unification may proceed.

To this end, we have endeavored to speak plainly, and in love to utter truths, which we know must excite either pain or derision or both, but which if pondered in the spirit in which they were spoken, we are persuaded will contribute somewhat to—

ward enabling the watchmen to see eye to eye, and through the lifting gloom to telegraph signals to each other concerning the attitude and welfare and onward movements of that great host, the Army of the Lord.

---

### ART. III.—REPLY TO "AN ANGLICAN CATHOLIC."

BY PRESIDENT J. W. NEVIN.

THE respected writer of the immediately preceding paper, on the *Basis of Union*, will not take it amiss, I am sure, that I should use the article here as an occasion for what may be considered a very general, and more or less desultory, rejoinder to certain parts of its argument. The appearance of the article indeed in the *Mercersburg Review*, I take to be in itself a sort of friendly apologetic challenge to some such responsive attention. It courts discussion, and has for its object "an interchange of views." Courtesy itself requires, therefore, that it should not go without notice.

I am pleased at the same time, that the article has been allowed to appear in the *Mercersburg Review*. Some, I know, have found fault, because a *Lutheran* argument against Dr. Hodge, was admitted into the *Review* a short time since;\* en-

---

\* The Rev. Dr. Krauth's masterly article on "Infant Salvation in the Calvinistic System;" which has since been republished, in fuller form, as a neat volume of eighty pages, by the Lutheran Book-store, 117 N. Sixth St., Philadelphia. It would be hard to find within the same compass a more demolishing historical argument for its own object. It fastens on the Calvinistic system as taught by the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly, beyond all question, the horrible doctrine that many infants dying in infancy, are damned eternally for Adam's sin. No Presbyterian now, of course, would dare to preach this, although it flows necessarily from the old Calvinistic doctrine of election. Yet Princeton affects to be true as ever to that metaphysical principle of salvation; and only the other day in the *Repertory*, took occasion to endorse Dr. Schneck's miserable travesty of "*Mercersburg Theology*"—garbled quotations and all—in the way of cautionary monition to our German Church of the Heidelberg Catechism. Why was no notice taken at the same time of the truly scientific, and absolutely crushing publication of the Rev. Dr. Krauth? Why is it allowed, indeed, to go without notice, anywhere, from either Presbyterian or Low Dutch brethren, who have before this always resented the reproach of "infant damnation" as a slander? The point is not a small one. It

tertaining the opinion, it would seem that it betokened, somehow, a want of proper zeal for the confessional honor of the general Reformed Church. But no such prejudice can deserve respect. It is foreign, especially, from the professed character and reigning spirit of the *Mercersburg Review*; which claims the distinction of being "an organ for Christological, Historical and Positive Theology," representing it is true a particular branch of the Reformed Church, but this at the same time in the broadest and most catholic view. No denominationalism, ecclesiastical or theological, that holds itself exclusively to its own separate limits, shunning communication with all Christian life beyond itself, can be otherwise than narrow-minded, unfree, and sectarian in the worst sense of the term. In this time especially, when by a sort of common consent, there is so much professed lamentation over the divisions of the Church, and so general a cry for union, what must be thought of any theology or church life that can join in with the cry, and yet stubbornly close itself against even the most remote advance toward the realization of such union? It is not enough here, that religious bodies hold with one another the fellowship of mere external forbearance and respect. The idea of union, even in the ethical order, and still more in the sphere of religion, calls for reciprocal inward communication of life with life in some way, and cannot be satisfied without it. Hence the need of free amicable inter-denominational conference and discourse on the subject, far beyond all that has yet been reached or attempted in any quarter. I agree with my "Anglican Catholic" critic in full, therefore, when he says, that the question of Christian Union demands a frank comparison of differing

---

strikes deep and reaches far. Neither the Presbyterian Church nor the Low Dutch Church now, we know very well, hold any such abominable doctrine. Why not then say so openly, and as openly confess a real falling away to this extent at least (and this involves a great deal more) from the Decrees of Dort, and the Westminster Confession? There is no shame in such rupture with dead confessional traditions. It is coming, and must come more and more, by historical necessity, on all sides, opening the way toward a better and more glorious future. Neither is the movement confined by any means to the Churches of the Reformed Confession. Lutheranism is not dead; and therefore Lutheranism also moves. It can never be again, and never ought to be again, just what it was in the sixteenth century.

views in regard to it, and a spirit of mutual concession on all sides; when he says, that it should be possible to discuss it without stirring up bad feeling; and also when he adds, that "certainly, if this cannot be done, no greater proof could be given, that we all need to remember from whence we are fallen, and to repent and do our first works."

### I. *The Evangelical Alliance.*

My critic, styling himself "an Anglican Catholic," has a good deal to say in regard to the Evangelical Alliance, for the purpose of justifying the attitude of the "Churchman" in regard to it, as noticed in the introductory portion of my review of Bishop Coxe's book "Apollos." Without any controversial discussion of the particular merits or demerits of that body, I may be allowed to state, in a brief general way, my own estimate of its significance in relation to the cause of Christian union.

The Alliance, in its very nature, is no permanent organization. It is a purely voluntary association of representatives from different portions of the Christian world, for the purpose of promoting common understanding, and common right disposition, with regard to the acknowledged obligation of all Christians, to be one in the Lord. The successive general conventions of the body, as it is called in this very loose sense, hold no inward necessary connection with one another. They are not joined together by any law of corporate, historical continuity. The late Conference in New York, was not bound in any way by the action of previous Conferences in the old world; and it had no power to bind in any way the action of any Conference that may be called anywhere hereafter. With progressive change in the life and spirit of the Christian world, (for which room is made more and more, continually, in the course of things throughout the world at this time), progressive change may be looked for, also in the character of this representative body. It must always reflect the reigning sense of the period, in which it is brought together, and in doing so may help that sense onward at the same time, toward something

still better than itself. The main worth of the institution perhaps, is just its power to gather in this way into some common consciousness and common utterance (however obscure), the mind of the Christian world at a given time, in regard to the great general interest to which it owes its birth. In this view alone, if in no other, it is a grand imposing phenomenon in the history of modern Protestantism, which all who love the peace and unity of the Church should regard with respect.

To say then, that with the Evangelical Alliance "the bond of union" means certain dogmas formulated in Freemasons' Hall, London, in the year of our Lord 1846, is not just correct. That scheme of supposed necessary truths was indeed formulated for the Alliance which then, for the first time, came together; and no doubt it was imagined by many, that it was to be a sort of fixed platform or confession of faith, on which the body should continue to stand in all subsequent meetings. In such view, it is easy to see, it was the poorest sort of crude theological namby-pambyism that could well be imagined. It was at best a lame contrivance, to bar off negatively such elements as were taken to be not fully up to the proper evangelical mark, by the help of a few aphoristic generalities, that had in them very little distinct, positive Christian meaning whatever. But the scheme belonged in fact only to the beginning of the Alliance movement, and cannot be considered the bond in any proper sense by which it has been held together since. Each new Convention has been its own bond for the time; and so the Convention last year in New York, was a new coming together simply of the Protestant Christian world represented by it, under circumstances widely different from those of the London meeting in 1846, in no way bound by that, and having in itself full freedom to act in the cause of church union, as to itself might seem best in the midst of the conditions of the year 1873. Hence there was no attempt with the body to establish either a doctrinal or ecclesiastical basis of any sort for its fellowship. No such attempt could possibly have resulted otherwise than in general confusion. The body had not met for any purpose of that sort, and wisely kept clear of it in all its transactions.



This may seem like reducing the Alliance meeting to a small matter. Be it so, if we choose to look at it in that light. Still it was all the meeting itself proposed to be; and we have no right to judge it by a different rule; to say, either that it imagined itself to be more than this, or that it ought to have been more than this—an agency, namely, for the direct actualization of organic unity, rather than an agency for the promotion simply of federal union—and then to condemn it for plainly coming short of any such purpose. The meeting was not blind to the difference between these ideas; for it was referred to, over and over again. Let it be judged then by the sense it had of its own constitution and mission. Thus only can we deal justly with the question of its merits.

That question becomes then two-fold; first, whether union without formal unity is worth anything for the true oneness of the Church; secondly, whether the Alliance can be regarded as being in fact a successful agency at all for its own purpose, namely, the promotion of Christian union.

## *II. Unity and Union.*

As to the second of the two points just stated, there would seem to be no room for honest doubt. The Alliance has done much already, and may be expected to do still more in time to come, for the cause of Christian union. It originated in the feeling, that the divisions of Christendom are a deplorable evil, and that they should be brought to an end; and its agency, from the beginning, has served thus far very effectually to extend and deepen this feeling. Without breaking up denominational distinctions in any way, it has worked as a silent force far and wide to undermine and weaken the hard exclusiveness of these distinctions. Other manifold influences belonging to the age, have been working providentially in the same direction; influences, negative partly (in the giving way and breaking up of old things), and partly positive (in the coming in of new things); and the Alliance has formed a sort of focus for all, without knowing it, bringing all to grand central expression, and clothing it with a voice of power for the awakened

conscience of the Christian world. This falls vastly short still, it is true, of what the full problem of Christian union requires. But let us not despise the day of small things. As far as it goes, it is in itself, nevertheless, a very great thing, worthy of being hailed by all in St. Paul's language: "What then? Notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached"—the oneness of Christ's torn body, the Church, is preached—"and I therein do rejoice, yea, and *will* rejoice."

It will not do to say that the Convention of last October, in New York, came and went without any sort of help toward the bringing in of that better day of the Church, toward which the signs of the age are pointing, and for which the heart of the world is longing more and more with earnest expectation. It was in this respect much more than any preceding Convention, in London, Paris, Berlin, Geneva, or Amsterdam. It moved the Christian world more in its inauguration; it was more of a power during its sessions; it continues to be of more historical significance since. I mean by this, no undue glorification. The Convention had its imperfections, sufficiently palpable and gross. It was in no sense properly ecumenical and catholic. The good and the solid that was in it, as a matter of course, was joined with a large mixture of what was not good, and not solid by any means. It was for the most part, with all its acknowledged wealth of learning and mind and heart, but a poor, ephemeral and superficial expression of the glorious idea of "one Lord, one faith, one baptism," which it had come together from the ends of the earth to proclaim. Even the Apostolic Creed, which we all joined in reciting on the first day, with a sort of resolute will and firm voice, led by the Very Reverend Dean of Canterbury, was not for this occasion, as one could hardly help feeling, a trumpet of *altogether* sure and certain sound.\* In spite of all this,

\* The Rev. Dr. S. I. Prime, one of the chief managers of the meeting, has since told us in the *N. Y. Observer*, that he at least, does not believe that Christ "descended into hell or hades," in any sense which denies that He "went directly into Paradise—heaven—the third heaven," and that therefore he never repeats that clause of the Creed. A fair example, no doubt, of what was in the mind of others also on this occasion; who had no power to see, that a *subaudition* of such sort at this point must affect necessarily the right Christological sense of the entire symbol.

however, the meeting was a religious power of the highest order, and making all due allowance for the infectious enthusiasm of the hour, we may apply to it still, without much extravagance, the following tribute of praise rendered to it at the time by the *New York Tribune* :

"This meeting together—Alliance, as it is properly called—of the representatives of so many differing sects and denominations of Christianity—representatives as well of the culture and scholarship, of the best thought, the noblest endeavor, and the purest living of the universal Christian Church—has of itself set on foot inquiry and provoked thought. Even the men with muck-rakes, whose whole life is in the market they buy and sell in—an intense devotion of a pittance of time to getting a pittance of money—have lifted up their faces wonderingly, and in a dull way asked its meaning ; while the brainless crowd who grovel in sense and live in vacuity, have almost risen to a comprehension of the fact of a higher life than vegetation, and some purpose in it nobler and more exalted than the eye of sense reveals. Taken out of the realm of the spiritual and moral, and viewed simply as an incitement to intellectual processes, a spur to thought, this conference has been the most important ever held upon the Continent. The subjects it aspired to treat are of infinite moment and universal application, and to their consideration the ripest scholarship and profoundest learning have been brought. It would be strange—a phenomenon indeed—if in the large debate of these ten days covering, as it has, all the greatest problems at which mankind has wrestled and tugged always since the fall, there had not been imperfection, shallowness of reasoning, unsound logic, impatience of opposition, uncharitableness, weariness, and vanity. These things, whatever the occasion, we may expect always. But there have been, on the other hand, large contributions to the sum of human knowledge and the results of human thought ; and what is more and better, a large advance in tolerance, catholicity, charity. The Christian world draws close together. Differences in uniform and armor, in watchwords and countersigns, are growing smaller and counting

for less. The larger interpretation of the need of 'eternal vigilance' dawns. It is the price not of liberty alone, but of everything. Christianity, that for nearly nineteen centuries has canopied itself in the security of a date line that recognizes 'Our Lord' in reckoning from His birth, finds the need of it, and the Christian world awakes to a sense of its besetments."

Say even that the service of the Alliance to the cause of Christian union has been mainly negative only; a protest simply against things as they are; a cry of, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord;" an attempt, however fruitless, to clear the way for His coming, to break down mountains and fill up vallies, to make crooked things straight and rough places plain, and thus to open up through the desert of a divided and scattered Christendom "a highway for our God." Who will call in question still the vast significance of its power, even in this view? The world at large has felt the challenge. It has gone home more or less to the conscience of all our Protestant Churches. It has caused "great searchings of heart for the divisions of Reuben," even among those who have not been able to show toward it any open sympathy or favor. Bishop Horatio Potter, of New York, might be impassive to the great movement. But not so all bishops. Episcopalianism in general felt it. It was felt by the "Churchman."

So much as to the worth of the Alliance for the cause of simple union. But then comes the other question; namely, the worth of all this for the cause of true church unity.

The Alliance meeting it is charged, in the first place, did not look at all to such unity; it was not the object of its coming together. Granted. Its object was professedly and openly, to promote the "association of Christians of all countries, in a cordial, visible and effective union;" nothing more. To have attempted more would have been madness. This of itself, however, was not an ignoring or rejection of the idea of organic unity. Some no doubt took it in that way. But even the language of Dr. Hodge—which displeased many—does not absolutely shut out the hope of such unity in time to come; and still less can the addresses of Bishop Bedell, the Dean of Can-

terbury and others, though seeming to look the same way, be fairly taken in any such extreme sense. The existing state of the Church—not any future state—was what these declarations looked to; and in reference to this, it was in fact as clear as day, that there was no room to talk or think of coming at once to anything like organized unity. The problem of the hour, the only problem which brought the Alliance together, was not any such unity (absolutely impracticable in the circumstances), but the bringing to pass of present practicable conjunction and co-operation among the different divisions of the Protestant Christian world, in the service of the common ends of Christianity; without waiting for farther unity; leaving the whole question of such farther unity open for future consideration and action, as the progress of the union movement itself, under the guidance of God's Spirit, might be found hereafter to necessitate and require. That was, and still is, the only acknowledged *theory* of the Alliance; and no one has a right to burden it with any other theory. If Dr. Hodge, and some others, have really looked upon a mere confederation of existing religious denominations and sects as being *all* that is needed for the actualization of full Christian unity, and have pleased themselves with the dream, that this all was in fact already reached, for the vision of angels, in the New York Conference, (which is hardly credible), I can only say that the great body of that Conference certainly entertained no such dream. The union then and there was taken to be a demonstration of substantive oneness, belonging to the diversity of confessions represented in it, and in this view a great matter for the time; but it was not viewed by any means as a finality. It was only the auspicious inception and prognostication of better things to come—a rainbow of hope made to span the departing storm-cloud of ecclesiastical jealousy and strife. That was much. But behind it lay the promise of a great deal more.

Just here, however, we reach the full gist of this Episcopalian controversy with Christian union, as not being in and of itself at once Christian unity. Even if the Alliance did not mean in New York, to make their union stand for the true unity of

the Church; did not mean, as the Churchman has charged, "that corporate union was neither possible nor desirable" in the future, "but that union in spirit, and in aim was all that in any case, ought to be attempted, and that this already existed to a satisfactory degree;" still its mere purpose, and attempt to get at union without unity, we are told, must be regarded as coming virtually to the same thing. It is schism, therefore, even in its show of union, because it has failed to go first of all, into the question of church organization, and to settle it in the so-called Anglican Catholic form. The meeting in New York, was in this respect a "mischievous, deadly error," and nothing less in truth, than a "woful travesty of Christianity," which has issued judicially only in confusion since, demonstrating the baselessness of this idea of Christian union, and making room thus for the true, better basis offered in the constitution of the Episcopal Church.

"Whatever the ideas of Christian union, in the Evangelical Alliance were, or were not," says my *Anglican Catholic* critic, "there is one thing, that they certainly were not. And that is the old idea, that the Episcopate is the bond of union, appointed by the Lord, and transmitted by succession from the Apostles." But just this, he holds to be the indispensable root of the Church, and of all faith in the Church; so that being at fault here, the Alliance, in his view, stands judged as it were out of its own mouth. For "any *Christian Union*," that comes short of "Unity of the Church"—meaning by this Episcopally organized and accredited unity—"is no union at all, but schism."

### III. *Episcopacy as a bond of Unity.*

I have no mind to plunge at all into the dismal swamp of the controversy about bishops. There has been vast waste of words with it in past time, and no end of blind argument on all sides. "It is pleasing to observe," says my critic, "that the Rev. Dr. Nevin yields the point that St. Cyprian *was* a bishop, and not simply the moderator of a presbytery as the Presbyterians of Bishop Sage's time claimed. Two hundred

years have wrought this change. Perhaps in less than two hundred years more, the Presbyterian may be willing to acknowledge not only that St. Cyprian was a bishop, but that he was such by Divine right." Certainly I should be sorry to be bound slavishly by old confessional issues here or anywhere else. This freedom I owe, however, to German more than to Anglican science. I have no difficulty in owning the presence of the Episcopal system throughout the Church in the second century. The Epistles of Ignatius, take them as we may, prove it. But, as I have said in my "Apollos" article, the system is not in the New Testament, as Episcopalianism is fond still of arguing. It came in only after the destruction of Jerusalem; not without elementary preparation in the time going before; and of course then not without the counsel and sanction also of such apostolical aid as was still at hand at that time in the world. This, with the common need of that critical transition period, is sufficient to account for its general introduction. The whole state of the Church plainly underwent material change during the time in question. Let us trust, that Episcopalian prejudice here will yet at last show itself pliant also, no less than Presbyterian prejudice; and that long before two hundred years shall have rolled around, Christianity will have reached that blessed millennial reintegration, in which there shall be neither Greek nor Jew, neither Episcopalian nor Presbyterian, but Christ shall be literally all and in all.

That the introduction of the Episcopal system had for its object largely the binding together and holding together of the churches, in that ecumenical unity which lay in the conception of Christianity, but for which no settled provision had previously been made, is abundantly clear; as it is clear also, that it was a wise and more or less effectual provision for such purpose. But this falls very far short of the notion, that it was a *jure divino* constitution in the sense of "An Anglican Catholic's" argument, and that it was so joined by the Lord to His Church, by outward ordination, from the beginning, as to be essential to its very being to the end of time.

Such notion turns the "bond of unity" at once into a prin-



ciple of unity; and then of course easily leaps to the monstrous conclusion, that the external form in the case goes before the internal life, defining and determining of itself the unity of this life, and making all outside of its measure to be no better than unbelieving schism.

But this is just that mechanical notion of organization, which seems to me to fall short of the true idea of Christian life and Christian unity altogether. To claim for it a divine character does not mend the matter in the least, so far as the question is concerned: May Christianity be viewed rightly as growing forth anywhere principally from mere outward ordination, either human or divine? Every such view shifts the mystery of faith from its true basis, and tends to break up the inward vital order of the Christian Creed.

Take, for example, the perverse stress which the Baptists lay on their notion of Christian Baptism. The signification of the sacrament resolves itself into this, that our Lord has been pleased to ordain it as a first act for us to perform in the way of obedience to His authority. It is in this way a test of our sincerity in coming to Him and looking to Him for salvation. All depends then on our strict conformity to the outward rule itself; hence on our personal consciousness of doing what it requires, which makes the baptism of infants superstitious and profane; and hence also on the form of immersion, because this is taken to be the precise recipe or formula of the original prescription, and to depart from it in the least is necessarily to violate the ordinance as a crucial test of Christian obedience. What can be more mechanical and outward? Yet on this point, as we know, the Baptist thinking plants itself as a very principle or *principium* of the whole evangelical life, the fountain source of the universal Church; making it in this way nothing less in truth than a *jure divino* "bond of unity" for the Church; a sort of *cordon sanitaire*, beyond and outside of whose magic inclosure lies the territory of schismatical pravity, with which no Baptist Churchman should own any communion whatever.

And all this magnification of the outward form of the sacrament at the fatal expense, at the same time, of its inward es-

sence! The most ghastly killing of the spirit by the letter that can well be conceived! The old Pharisaic legalism over again, tything mint, anise and cummin, and turning the weightier matters of the law—the soul of the sacraments, the life of the Church, the whole supernatural sense of the Creed—into hypocrisy and sham.

Is there not room, I ask, for the *de te fabula narratur* here, in application to that Episcopal theory of Church unity which we are now considering? The theory which sees in the episcopate, as a mere outward ordinance of the Lord, the "bond of unity," in such sense that the organic oneness of the Church is to be regarded as in fact constituted by the bond which is thus supposed to coop it together externally (like the hooping of a cooper's vessel), and to have within itself no other deeper and more inward power of self-production and self-conservation—such as belongs to all other really organic life—coming before this bond, and making room in reality for all its subsequent worth. Organization so-called, which is brought to pass by mere outward regulation, arrangement or ordering of any sort, is not organic union at all in the proper sense of the term. It can never, as such, give us the unity we profess to believe in when we recite the Creed. It can never therefore, of itself and by itself, be that true apostolical unity, which of itself fastens on all beyond itself the condemnation of unbelief or schism.

For if that were so, who may not see that such outward bond of union must be at once the very principle or source of union, and so the very beginning of the Christian life itself; nay the very pillar and ground of the truth (as it is taken to be in the Roman scheme), and in this way the first object of all true Christian faith? For that which makes the Church one must be that which originates the very being of the Church; the unity being inseparable from this; so that the institution of the episcopate rises thus to the dignity of a primary and cardinal point of faith for the universal Christian life. And yet it has no place in any of the first Christian Creeds. More than that; it is to mistake the true nature of Christian faith altogether to suppose that it can terminate, first or last, on this or on any other

merely external ordination, externally taken, as its proper object. Faith, in its Christian view, regards universally not the outward, but the inward—not the natural, but the spiritual and supernatural—not the merely historical in the case even of our Lord Himself, but directly and first of all only the ideal, that is the invisible in the historical, without which this can have no divine meaning whatever. Not to see and own this, is to subvert (whether men mean it or not) the whole conception of faith. What must we think then of the proposition, that to accept the institution of the episcopate, *presumed* to be of outward historical appointment on the part of our Lord or His Apostles, is not only an obligation of faith, but in truth such an obligation as excludes the possibility of any right Christian faith in any other form?

The Roman Catholic scheme of Christianity, as carried out especially in its latest Vatican or Jesuitic form, is at once the most startling exemplification of this externalism—this violent tying of the inward to the outward, the spirit that quickeneth to the letter that killeth—in the broadest and most melancholy view. It ends there in the mechanism of an infallible Pope, the vicegerent of Christ by divine external historical ordination; the only logical issue of which at last is, no direct living communication with the invisible and divine whatever; no faith that reaches home at all to the objective supernatural reality of the Christian salvation behind the veil; but instead of this, blind trust only in the external machinery of a purely external Church, and a wilful perversion of the whole idea of faith into the notion of a stolid unquestioning corpse-like passivity in the hands of the sacerdotal rulers of the Church. Such is the *monstrum horrendum* now held up to the gaze of the civilized world, by the late Vatican Council.

The Episcopalian theory now under consideration, of course, means no such monstrosity as this. But I cannot help feeling that there is a certain degree of the same error at work (as is the case with the Baptist test of evangelical obedience also), when the episcopate as a mere outward institute, supposed to be of divine right, is put forward as the "bond of Church unity,"

in such sense as to make it the principle of Church unity, and so of Church existence (like the papacy with Roman Catholics), thus placing all Christianity outside of this hierarchical order in the category at once of open and clear schism.

I must go still farther, and repeat again kindly what I have said before; namely, that in my opinion "the high-church mechanism of episcopacy by divine right can come to its full sense and right end at last only in the Roman idea of a *jure divino* infallible centre," such as Rome finds in St. Peter and the apostolical succession of the Roman see. I see no inconsistency myself between this and the other passage in which I am quoted as saying, that "many outside of the Episcopal communion," in view of the present evil condition of things, would be glad to take refuge in it, "if it could show itself truly equal to the task of the times." For there, let me say, is just the sorrowful rub. With all its attractions and merits, the Episcopal communion is *not* showing itself truly equal to the mighty Church problem of the times. To the superficial it may seem to do this; but just because they are superficial, and have not yet reached at all in fact the true depth of the problem, in their own minds. The great difficulty lies precisely here, that the Episcopalian premises, as vaunted by the high-church school, lead over logically to the Roman conclusion, and a thinking man therefore cannot easily look to them as an end of controversy on the question of the Church.

"An Anglican Catholic" repels the imputation of a Romanizing tendency in the Episcopal system (which I have not meant however to be offensive at all), and goes into an argument of some length to show, that "in making this charge men of other denominations not only mistake what is Catholic for what is papal, but also are themselves in the very error which they endeavor to fix upon Episcopalians." I am not concerned at all to disturb the general construction of this argument. There is much in it that deserves serious consideration. Let it stand for what it is worth. I myself have long known and felt, and in one way and another have said also that there are ominous correspondences at different points between the spirit of the papacy and the

spirit of sect or schism; each of the two orders of religion holding like opposition in fact, from apparently opposite sides, to the true idea of the one Holy Catholic Church of the Creed, and doing what in them lies to obscure the apprehension of it for the faith of men. Every one of our sects, just so far as it is possessed by the sect spirit—which is most easy of common identification wherever it reigns—is at least a quiet, if not open assumption of all the high-toned prerogatives of an infallible Church. Each in its way affects to be the sum total of true Christianity, and has in itself constitutionally all the self-will and autocratic temper, all the intolerance and persecuting despotism of popery. That the two systems, therefore, Romanism and Sectarianism, should be found thinking and working together at different points, is only what might be expected, and I have no cause or wish in the world to dispute the fact or to keep it out of sight.

But it seems to me, this is by no means sufficient to establish the reasoning of "An Anglican Catholic," when he argues that the concurrence of Romanists and Non-episcopal Protestants in denying the divine right of Episcopacy, proves that this theory is the only true barrier against the Roman theory, and that all Non-episcopal bodies then, as a matter of course, are to be regarded as practically on the way to Rome. Episcopacy by divine right, he tells us is "the only idea that can make headway against the dogma of papal supremacy." And so he winds up triumphantly: "What system favors Romanism? And what system opposes it? Let any one read the history of the Council of Trent and answer. Could any denomination ever have come into existence, except upon the basis of this dogma of the Jesuits that Episcopacy does not exist by divine right? If this doctrine were rejected to-day, would not all the Christians in the world immediately be brought into subjection by the Episcopate? Certainly they would. This dogma is the one cause of Christian division in Western Christendom. And its collateral, the doctrine of the Papal supremacy, is all that maintains the schism of East and West, or Greek and Latin. The Papacy is therefore the one cause of the present divided

state of Christendom. And all who are in schism are where they are, only by virtue of having adopted this papal dogma."

There is a fallacy in this reasoning not hard to discover. It is as if Old Lutheranism should argue: The Roman doctrine of the real presence in the mass contradicts the Lutheran doctrine of so-called impanation; the Calvinistic or Reformed doctrine of the Lord's Supper does the same thing; *therefore* Calvinism is at bottom one with Romanism, and the only power that can make headway here against Rome is Lutheranism as embodied in the Form of Concord. Only grant the divine right of the Lutheran dogma, which the Jesuits deny, and who may not see that it must end all controversy also on the opposite Calvinistic side? "Would not all the Christians in the world," in that case, "immediately be brought into subjection" to the Lutheran *jure divino* creed? Certainly they would.

It is unnecessary to say that this could not of itself prove that the Lutheran theory was divine, or that it had not in it after all a constitutional affinity with the Roman theory. And just so, in the case now before us, it does not follow because the general acknowledgment of the divine right of Episcopacy would certainly do away with Non-episcopal Christianity among Protestants, either that Episcopacy is therefore of divine right, or that it may not have in it an inward determination nevertheless toward the central power of the Papacy, as its own proper logical complement and end.

That is all I have meant in saying, that the "high-church mechanism of episcopacy by divine right can come to its full sense and right end at last only in the Roman idea of a *jure divino* infallible centre." The remark regards not the system of episcopacy as such, but that view of it by which it is made to be, by *ab extra* appointment on the part of Christ, the essential bond of unity for the Church in the sense of being at the same time, the very principle of its existence, fixing thus the stigma of schism on all Christian life outside of such mechanism. That theory or scheme, I repeat (not the mind of those who hold the theory necessarily, but the animating soul of the theory itself,) cannot consistently stop short of a like mechanical cen-

tralization at last in some such primacy as that of the see of Rome. Both logic and history, it seems to me, justify this judgment.

Logically ; no outward bond of unity can be sufficient for its purpose, that is not itself one. A multitude of bishops can no more bind the Church into one, than a multitude of presbyters. The Episcopal bond of unity must therefore, itself be bound ; and that involves somewhere the idea of a central primacy, a chair of St. Peter, a Pope.

Historically ; the view which identified the episcopate with the unity of the Church in the beginning, ran in fact from the first toward this idea of a central primacy as its proper goal, and had no power to stay itself in its course till that goal was fairly reached. As I have said before, all ecclesiastical honesty requires us to admit the fact of an early tendency in this way to centralize the unity of the general episcopate itself in the see of Rome. "We feel it in Ignatius ; it comes to full blossom in Cyprian ; it is Romanism out and out in Augustine." Particular argument on this point here would be tedious ; neither do I consider it necessary. As a mere matter of history it appears to me to admit of no doubt.

"An Anglican Catholic" thinks, indeed, that I put a new sense on Cyprian's *Episcopatus unus est cujus a singulis in solidum pars tenetur* ; and finds it not in harmony with certain ecclesiastical facts which he quotes. I was not aware that my interpretation was new ; and cannot well see how it is possible to be satisfied with any other construction. There is a clear historical movement in the doctrine of the Church from the beginning ; both as regards the conception of it, and as regards its empirical constitution ; these two sides of the movement conditioning each other in fact throughout, but the first in the nature of the case leading the way for the second. The conception rose out of the idea of Christ and Christianity, as we have it in the article of the Creed—*One Holy Catholic Church*. Along with this went the application of the conception to the actual outward Christian body, in which it was felt that the idea of the Church, with all its essential attributes must inhere. The



congruence between the two was assumed at first without reflection. But it became apparent gradually that the ideal and the actual in the case were not thus strictly congruent in fact; and hence arose what was felt to be the imperative need of harmonizing them, so as to find in the actual empirical Church the elements that lay with *a priori* necessity in the ideal Church. One of these elements was unity. For this satisfactory provision seemed to be found for a time in the episcopate, as it first meets us in Ignatius. It could not be long, however, till it was seen and felt that something more than the episcopal institute, abstractly considered, was required to maintain the outward oneness of the Church; since bishops were capable of forsaking the true fold of Christ no less than others. Here comes in accordingly, the Cyprianic theory, having for its object the determination of a true unity for the episcopate itself, without which it could be of no significance whatever for binding the Church together as one.

This unity, for its purpose, must be not simply ideal, but empirically real, like the required oneness of the Church itself. Hence the thought that underlies the whole tract *De unitate ecclesiae*, and meets us everywhere in Cyprian, that the true episcopate is an orb meeting together from all sides in a common centre, answerably to the relation of the general apostolate to the person of St. Peter. It is everywhere one office in *solidum*—and outside of such solidarity, of course, not of any actual worth or force whatever as a bond of unity. "Deus unus est," we hear him saying, Ep. 40, "et Christus unus, et una ecclesia, et una cathedra, super Petrum Domini voce fundata." Take this any way we please, as respecting either idea or outward fact, it comes to the same thing for our present purpose. It shows that in the mind of Cyprian the solidarity of the episcopate meant its organization around a common centre, and points unquestionably to the fact that this centre even in his time was supposed to be resident in some way in the Bishop of Rome. History fell in thus with logic. The doctrine which makes the mechanism of the episcopate the absolute principle and norm of Church unity, could not rationally come to any other conclusion.

If there are things in the life and conduct of Cyprian, or any other church father, that seem to conflict with Cyprian's theory here, it cannot be helped. I should be sorry to be under the necessity of making Cyprian or any other church father agree with himself either on this or on other points. No one of them was infallible by any means.

And so of course I am not pleading the Cyprianic theory of the Church, by any means, as authority against the modern Anglo-Catholic theory, in any such sense as to imply that the Christianity of the third century, fairly represented by Cyprian, or the Christianity of the Nicene period following it, should be held of binding force for the Christian world now; so that Protestantism, for example, must be charged with error, in proportion exactly as it fails to comport with this primitive standard and rule. That is not the meaning at all of my argument. Modern Anglicanism is not the Church system of the third century or of the Nicene period. "The conditions of modern catholicity," says Bishop Coxe, "do not permit me to speak as I must have done in the days of Cyprian. This is felt so deeply that the tone of a Cyprian in these days, excites disgust. It is illogical and impertinent." The appeal then which "An Anglican Catholic" makes to the age of Cyprian is for the point here in discussion of no account in my eyes, because Anglicanism, in the first place, is not one with the Cyprianic system; and cannot therefore rightly base its theory of an outward bond of unity in a body of bishops without an outward centre, on Cyprian's theory of a solid episcopal corporation held together in some way by a central *cathedra* answering to the apostolical primacy of St. Peter. But even if that were otherwise, the appeal would still have for me no conclusive force; because, with all my acknowledged regard for Cyprian and his age, I can see no reason for making either the man or his age here a standard of absolute Christian truth and right. Christianity as it stood in the age of Cyprian, and as it stood in the Nicene age, can by no means be taken as a safe pattern of what Christianity should be in the present age, or as the true ideal of what the Christian world must reach after to solve in time

to come the problem of Catholic unity. No protest against the ecclesiastical and theological errors of modern Romanism, I am well persuaded, can be valid or truly Protestant, which is not at the same time a protest against the principal working of the same errors in the third and fourth centuries. Cyprianic Christianity is at best embryonic Romanism, as can be easily shown in many things.

#### IV. Organic and Historical.

"An Anglican Catholic" charges me with not making proper account of the great ideas of organism and history, as they have to do with the true doctrine of the Church. This is a broad subject. All I can say of it here must reduce itself to a few general and loosely connected observations.

My own objection to the Episcopal scheme, as it is put forward in the book "Apollos," has turned just on this point that it has seemed to me not to distinguish rightly between organism and mechanism, making an external episcopate the bond of Church unity in the sense of a principle of such unity, and so in the sense of a very *principium essendi* for the universal life of the Church itself. That is the mistake of Romanism. It makes its hierarchy a divine construction, a mechanical vessel, so to speak, like Noah's ark, to whose bosom then the Christian faith is intrusted, that it may so pass the waves of this troublesome world, and finally come to the land of everlasting life. The mistake abounds also in the Patristic theology. It serves necessarily to invert the true order of the Christian life. It gives us for an organism what is at best the notion only of an external fabrication.

My critic himself shows some right sense of the difference between these conceptions. An organism, he says, lives; life always manifests itself in this way; it is vain to attempt to distinguish between the inner and the outer life; they are both one. And this strangely enough, he applies as holding against my proposition, "that if either popery or episcopacy be essential to the being of the Christian Church, it must be under the view of their being in some way along with their outward ordi-

nation, a true concretion or outbirth from the inward life of the Church." That, he will have it, is "the Romish doctrine of development differently applied," according to which, as he takes it, room is made for any innovation in Church order which the inward life of the Church may wilfully originate. Therefore the absolute need, he argues, of an outward apostolical order to keep the action of this life within its proper bounds. .

But here at once the critic betrays his own error. His "inner and outer life," in the case of the Church, if I understand him rightly, are after all a divine composition only, and not a true organism; just as he says of man, that "he is a compound being made up of soul, body and spirit; when these are *combined*, man is organized and lives; when they are *separated*, he is disorganized and dies; his organism is then *taken apart*." Much, one might suppose, like the taking apart of a watch.

In its true conception, an organism (as different from an organization) is not an inward compounded in this way with an outward; but the concrescence of inward and outward together from a single principle, which is then felt through all the parts as the power of one and the same life.

That is what I mean in saying that what is *essential to the being* of the Church must be "a true concretion or outbirth from the inward life of the Church."

Such concretion is anything but what my critic stigmatizes as *accretion*, in trying to make out here a common character between Romanism and Sectarianism. Concretion is the opposite of abstraction. The very difficulty I make with the Roman, Patristic, and high-church Episcopalian theory of church unity, is that it gives us for the purpose an outward appointment abstractly taken (like the Baptist's touchstone of discipleship found in bald obedience to Christ's appointment of the outward ceremony of baptism), instead of a living power growing forth concretely from the one organic spiritual constitution of the Church. The difference between the two conceptions, to my own mind at least, is clear and very material.

I hope I do not wrong the argument of "An Anglican Catholic;" but he really seems to me to confound the idea of

an organism with the mere outward form or system by which life works; as when he seems to say, for example, that the organic nature of man comes to an end with the breaking up of his natural body, and that his spirit afterward cannot be said to live organically at all until it gets its organism again in the resurrection of the last day. That indeed would illustrate happily the notion: no Bishop, no Church; no peripheral hierarchy to begin with, and so then no inner life of the Church to end with; that is, no unity, no catholicity, no holiness, no one attribute of the Church, but at best a certain amount of disembodied Christian spirit only, waiting to be clothed upon with an organization at some future time. But perhaps I have failed to catch here exactly what the writer of the article on the *Basis of Union* really means.

Along with his criticism on my view of concrete organization, as requiring the outward life of the Church to be in some way an outbirth from its inward life, goes his criticism (no less confused and erroneous I must be allowed to say) on my view of historical Christianity; which, in his judgment, is out and out the development theory made use of by the Church of Rome to justify all her assumptions. Quoting what I say, in my review of "Apollon," of the dream of bringing all things right "by an unhistorical pilgrimage of our whole modern Christendom to the tombs of the fathers, martyrs, and confessors, who fell asleep in the Lord fifteen hundred years ago," he breaks forth into the following energetic language:

"Never before have we seen in any place by any evangelical Christian so complete an acknowledgment that history and antiquity are both against the modern sectarian idea. Nowhere have we seen so complete an abandonment of the Catholic idea of Christian union, which binds us to the past as to one another. The appeal to history is a test which neither Rome nor Geneva can abide. But it is not common to see the whole case given up in this fashion, and everything rested upon development. Christianity is either a revelation or it is not. If it is a revelation, it was all revealed in the beginning. If it is not a revelation, it is what man chooses to make it."

This might just as well come from a Romanist (who also in his way fights off the idea of development), as from an Episcopalian or a Presbyterian; and it may well provoke a good-humored smile, to hear an Anglican Churchman pleasing himself with the imagination that *his* system, in distinction from Rome and Geneva, is the "all of revelation that was revealed from the beginning," and that he has it all now as a fixed historical tradition handed down to him without change from the primitive ages.

That is not history; and that is no right view of God's revelation. It is the outward again, as before, made to be more than the inward, the letter and form exalted above essence and spirit; and it ought to be evident to all now, that the time has forever gone by for making any effectual stand in behalf of Christianity against infidelity on any such mechanical basis, whether in Papal, or Presbyterian, or Episcopalian form.

Only think what it means, to say, that revelation was all revealed in the beginning, if that is to signify that the full sense of it was at once disclosed to the Christian world in the apostolic period, or in the age of Cyprian, or in the Nicene period. Why, the Word of God in the Bible is a mighty deep, a vast abyss, a boundless ocean of truth and life, and the Church has been all along only as one gathering a few pebbles or shells on its outmost beach. Talk of the understanding of it having been complete in the first ages, or in any age since! There is a holy derision, as from the eternal world, in the very thought!

And then what shall we say of a supposed exhaustive knowledge in this way of our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, on the part of the Church, from the beginning of the Christian dispensation? It gives one pain even to ask the question. Is He not the fulness of the Godhead bodily? And have the ages to come then nothing to learn from Him, nothing to know of Him, in the way of growing, deepening insight into the meaning of His person and work, far beyond all that has been handed down as an outward depositum, in fixed quantity and quality, from the first ages, or the middle ages, or the ages since the Reformation? The question, put in this way, is surely its own answer.

And now, who may not see, that the idea of such a living inexhaustible fountain of measureless truth and good—in the Bible and in Christ—which is no reservoir of stagnant traditions, doctrinal or ecclesiastical, but a "well of water springing up into everlasting life," the Word of God which is ζῶν καὶ ἐνεργῆς (Heb. iv. 12), and which liveth and abideth for ever; who may not see, I ask, that the source of Christian history, apprehended and thought of in this way, must necessarily impart to the historical stream of Christianity itself, through the ages, a corresponding character of ever flowing and ever changing life?

We need not call this development. For that is a treacherous amphibological term again, like baptismal regeneration or justification by faith, which may be taken in different senses, giving rise to endless contention. Let us call it simply historical movement. That is enough. Historical movement has its own universal character, just as truly as the working of natural law in the world of nature. And it is not a question at all whether the life of man shall be historical—shall be, not stationary, nor a circling recurrence of things simply to their own beginning, as in the world of nature, but an ongoing progress involving the birth of new things continually out of the bosom of old things. This is what history means; nothing less than this; and it belongs to the very idea of humanity, that it should exist in this form; and nothing which is really human can exist in any other form.

Shall we be told then that Christianity, because "if it was a revelation it was all revealed in the beginning," is not subject to this otherwise universal law of historical progress? What is that but to say, that Christianity is not human; that it is a gnostic abstraction, touching men only in an outward manner; that it has not entered as an immanent concrete power into the actual life of humanity in any way?

True Christianity has not been ever, and is not now, any such monstrous or magical unreality. It has been historical, in the full sense of the term, from the beginning. It has been so theologically; there is not a doctrine belonging to it, which



has not had its history, its rise, its movement, its progressive evolution and determination. So with the Christian life and worship. So with all ecclesiastical order. The very theory of the Church, Papal or Cyprianic or Anglo-Catholic, which now affects to exclude the historical element rightly so-called from its constitution, can easily itself be referred to a historical process of its own in the beginning. It came in with gradually unfolding growth; conception and practice working together, to bring it to pass in the fulness of its time; as all may see who have courage to read church history for themselves, instead of taking it cut and dry from ecclesiastical schools or systems.

The historical in this view, then, is *not* a breaking away from the substantive life of the past; but neither is it yet, most assuredly, a monotonous continuation of this life in its past forms; and so also never a taking up of such forms simply, from a past time, in an outwardly slavish way. It holds between these extremes, as an inward union of the new and the old, the flowing and the constant, in the power of one and the same life.

How this may be, it needs of course some effort of thought to see and understand; but I am not called upon here to go any farther into the subject.

*V. Theological first, and then ecclesiastical.*

In my article on Dr. Coxe's book, I speak of the dream of *The Churchman* in regard to making Episcopacy the beginning and fundament of the whole question of the unification of the Christian world at this time, as being in my opinion visionary; and then add: "The question of church unity, as the world now stands, involves immeasurably *more* than the government of the Church by bishops. It is theological first, and then ecclesiastical; not ecclesiastical first, and then theological."

Noticing the article soon after its appearance, the *Churchman* took issue with this particular position in the following plain terms:

"This, we distinctly challenge. We deny entirely that the theological basis of unity precedes the ecclesiastical. For

what is the theological basis, properly understood, but the Creed, the facts of essential belief? These facts rested in the beginning, not on any inherent probability, but on the witness of those who announced them. The authority of Apostles was the condition precedent to establishment of belief. As it was in the beginning, it is now. There are and can be ever two theories only of the way in which Divine truth comes to man. One is by revelation, the other by discovery. There are and can be but two theories only concerning the Church. One, that it is an institution, the other, that it is an invention. It is, we believe, on the vital difference between these two, which we see and trace through all variations of polity and schemes of belief, that the entire question of unity and of religion, indeed, turns. Dr. Nevin is too thoroughly a scholar to need that we should remind him that the ecclesiastical came before the theological, and that the Apostles, appearing as the ambassadors of Christ, presented to the world their credentials before they opened their mission. With a Congregationalist, who conceives of St. Paul preaching at Corinth precisely as a revivalist getting up an excitement in a Western town, it might be necessary to demonstrate; but Dr. Nevin is too familiar with the true aspect of the past, not to be aware that the early disciples took all their theological acquisitions only by and through the ecclesiastical fellowship, and that unity with the Church was the only possible test by which the correctness of theology was, or could be, tried."

Here we have at once a misapprehension of my meaning in the use of the word theological. It is taken as of one sense with doctrinal or dogmatic in systematic divinity. The latter part of my article shows abundantly, however, that I had no such thought as that in my mind; since I took the ground there that no doctrinal basis, either as at hand already with any of our denominations, or as something to be yet reached by interdenominational negotiation among them all, can ever be sufficient (any more than episcopacy itself) for the reintegration of the dismembered church into anything like true organic unity.

But the quotation is instructive, in the light it serves to

throw upon the *Churchman's* own theory of Christianity and the Church, which is found to be here again just the same scheme of mechanical supernaturalism, which it has been the object throughout of my present review of "*An Anglican Catholic*" in a friendly way to expose and refute.

The Creed—the living substance of the Creed—is with me indeed what I understand by theological, as different both from ecclesiastical and dogmatic. But I must utterly reject the view here broadly presented, that the Creed owes its authority in such form for faith to the outward testimony of the Church. I say—with all emphasis on the word—for *faith*; not for intelligence or rational trust, but for faith; which in its very nature has to do directly with the spiritual, with the invisible and the eternal, in their own light, and not through the medium merely of any outside foreign light.

We must distinguish between the facts of Christianity historically considered, and the ideal internal sense of these facts, which lies beyond them in the sphere of the supernatural. To see the outward Jesus, when He was on the earth, was not of itself to see the inward Christ; to perceive that great truth (the rock on which the Church is built) was no function of outward empirical knowledge in any way. Flesh and blood could not reveal it, we are told by our Lord Himself, but only the Father which is in Heaven. And just that inward revelation it is still, which alone can make the Christian Creed true for Christian faith. What falls short of that—the testimony of the Church, for example, or even the authority of apostles confirmed by miracles—may be of vast moment as a preliminary to faith; but it cannot be itself the very object of true Christian faith; for it is of itself external fact simply for knowledge and science; whereas faith, as differing from knowledge, has for its object the supernatural only and always.

The error of basing faith in this way on intermediate outward witness or authority lies at the ground of the whole Roman system; where the premise of an infallible, historical, ecclesiastical corporation (authenticated for knowledge by outside natural evidence) is supposed to be the very principle and power

of faith in every higher view. It is possible, however, and only too common in the Protestant world, to put the Bible also in the same wrong relation to faith; as is done universally where it is regarded as an outward text simply (divinely inspired), out of which the common understanding of men may draw the truths of faith for itself in a natural way!

The "Churchman" it seems to me, in the passage just quoted, falls into first this general fallacy in regard to the true nature of faith in its distinction from knowledge. The creed it will have to be simply *the facts of essential belief*; and these facts, it tells us, "rested in the beginning not on any inherent probability, but on the witness of those who announced them;" that is, on outward historical evidence, which in the nature of the case could have no power whatever to attest or verify for faith the actual divine interior life and soul of the facts.

No; the ecclesiastical is not before the theological in that way, either in order of being or in order of time; just as little as the Bible outwardly taken can be said to take precedence, in either view, of the Word of God in the Bible which "liveth and abideth forever."

If the opposite order were true, the Christian Creed should run: "I believe in a holy apostolical Church, authenticated to the world by rational credentials from heaven, and therefore, on the testimony of the Church, I believe in God the Father, and in His Son Jesus Christ," and so on to the close. That would be indeed ecclesiastical first, and then theological. X

The only true order is the other way, theological first and then ecclesiastical, as the Creed now stands. First is the order of the Christian salvation in its own objective constitution—Christ first, and then the full-orbed world of grace and truth proceeding forth from Christ. And how should there be then possibly any right order other than this for the subjective apprehension of the Christian salvation, any true method of faith other than the method of the Creed, as it now is and has been from the beginning?

The article of the Church itself (with its attributes, one, holy and catholic), never rested for faith, and rests for it not at all

*Dr M. forgets how a person would be condemned who had not the faith—a heathen for instance. How is he to know it without the preacher? and the preacher involves the ecclesiastical. Did our Lord send his*

now, on historical credentials or outward empirical fact of any sort ; but altogether in the first place on its ideal spiritual and eternal constitution, flowing forth with divine necessity from the life of our blessed Lord Himself, and actualizing itself as it best may, under its adverse conditions in this world, onward to the end of time.

The principle of the Church then, the beginning of its life, the true source and only effectual bond of its unity, sanctity and catholicity, is not any Christian dogma as such, nor yet any Church constitution as such, like the papacy or the episcopate ; but only and wholly our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, the Son of the Living God, as He is set forth briefly in St. Peter's confession and proclaimed at large in the Apostles' Creed.

In saying this, I mean no polemical disparagement of episcopacy itself ; just as little, as I mean a disparagement of any particular doctrine, or scheme of doctrine, by refusing in the same way to see in it the *fons et origo* of the Christian faith. What place either the doctrinal or the ecclesiastical, under a given view, may be destined to hold hereafter in the full actualization of Church unity, is another question. All I mean is, that neither of these interests, as the Christian world now stands—in a crisis, whether men lay it to heart or not, more profoundly trying than any through which it has ever yet passed—is sufficient to open the way for this unity ; and that no handling of either of them for such purpose, therefore, can be considered as of itself adequate in any sense to the severe demands of the problem. Neither the Evangelical Alliance nor Anglo-Catholic Episcopacy has yet touched bottom here. The subject calls for deeper probing and far more fundamental help.

Such help, I am solemnly persuaded, can only come through a deeper entrance than has ever yet been gained by the Church at large into the mystery of what the Bible is (Old Testament and New) as the living Word of the Living God ; and this especially through new and profounder entrance into the mystery of the personal Christ, the Lord of life and glory, "in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." To say that we know and possess all these treasures already, or to say that it

is enough for us to put ourselves for the purpose under the tuition and instruction of the Church in past ages (say the sixteenth century or the time of the Nicene fathers), is such extravagance, we have already seen, as can hardly be expressed. Yet practically this would seem to be very much the reigning thought of the Christian world at this time! Many indeed, in the Church and outside of the Church, are coming to feel more and more the sphinx-like solemnity of the mighty question, *What think ye of Christ?* But it is for the most part still only in a dim and cloudy way; while but a few here and there (amid the din of surrounding theological and ecclesiastical strife) are brought to see and own in it the germinant power of a coming new spiritual creation.

It were much—O how much!—if only our denominations generally, Episcopalian and Non-Episcopalian together, could be brought to suspect the sufficiency of their several stand-points, as held at present, and to ask themselves seriously whether there might not be after all a better way than any they have yet dreamed of, for the composition of their differences (in doctrine, order, worship and life), to be found in a common acknowledgment of the great Christological truth here affirmed, and along with this then a common endeavor to surrender themselves fully to the power of it through the obedience of faith.

The mere movement of men's minds generally in this way would be such an omen and promise, nay, such a real beginning of unity, as has not yet been offered to our view anywhere in any other form. It would be a giving up of the notion of manufacturing it by any outside purpose or plan of men themselves, doctrinal or ecclesiastical. It would be the flowing of men's minds in common toward a common centre, outside of themselves, and in this way their flowing together at the same time in the felt sense of a common Christian brotherhood.

And who can question the power of this centre to organize into true inward unity and order the elements of Christian life, thus brought into right relation to it from all sides? Where else have we, or can we have, the real principle of all true Christianity, the last and deepest ground of its universal oneness? And

how then may the divisions of Christianity begin even to be harmonized, otherwise than by their being referred practically to that which is infinitely deeper than themselves in this ground, the living power and glory of the Lord? Is it not just in this sense, that He is declared by St. Paul to be our PEACE, making Jew and Gentile one, breaking down the middle wall of partition between them, and so having power to break down also all other divisions by resolving them into the sense of a deeper relationship in God?

Let it not be said, we have what is here meant already; common faith in the same Christ, and a common looking to Him as the centre of the Christian life and the one only principle of Christianity. The imagination is false; plainly and immediately so, because the sundering forces at work among us are stronger on all sides than the common power by which we complacently assume that we are all thus drawn toward the Lord. If Christ—not the notion or doctrine of Christ nor a mere theory of His kingdom in the world, but the living Christ Himself—were indeed all in all for our several evangelical denominations (as they call themselves); were indeed the first object of their common faith, the one glorious Sun of righteousness in their several ecclesiastical heavens; there would be at once a giving way and breaking down of the walls of partition that now rise up between them. The partial and separatistic would of themselves relax their deadly hold on men's souls. Self-thinking, self-willing and self-working, would give place to thinking, willing and working in the Lord. There would be at once the reign of catholicity begun upon the earth. And most certain it is that this grand spiritual ἀποκαταστάσις, or restitution of all things, can never come in any other way.

Then we would know what faith means in its proper New Testament sense; and how it is that such wonderful power is ascribed to it in the Word. For it would be seen to be nothing less in truth than real conjunction with the life of the Lord Himself. A conception almost lost under the general rubbish of our modern traditions; as is implied indeed in that startling question of the Lord Himself: When the Son of Man cometh,



*shall He find faith on the earth?* Orthodoxy enough, it may be; ecclesiasticism enough, it may be; religion of mere sentiment and feeling enough, it may be; but faith? faith in Himself as the Son of God, the Lord of heaven and earth, and one with the Father? shall He find *that* on the earth?

But I pursue the subject here no farther. This is what I mean by the "immeasurably more" that underlies the problem of Church unity, than is presented by any question of government or doctrine simply, obtruding itself upon us, in the first place, as a preliminary external condition for all farther inquiry or action. This is what I mean by "theological first, and then ecclesiastical." Not dogma, speculation, or theory first; but the actual substantive mystery itself of Christianity, as we have it in the living Word; as we have it in the Creed; and there not in the Church first by any means, but in Christ Himself, who is the principle of the Creed, the origin and root of universal Christianity (as the beginning also of the whole creation of God), and so the perennial only fountain and source of the Church to the end of time. The theological is for us properly nothing other than this—namely, the Christological, the manifestation of God in His Son Jesus Christ, "in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life."

Sinking our souls deep then into this only principle of unity, this fountain of all charity and faith, let us pray in the language of our Trinity collect: "O God, the Creator and Saviour of the world, who hast made Thyself known in the work of man's redemption as the Mystery of the ever adorable Trinity, Father, Son and Holy Ghost, Three in One and One in Three; reveal in us, we beseech Thee, the full power of this faith, into which we have been planted by baptism; that being born of water and of the Spirit, we may by a life of holiness be formed into Thine image here, and rise to Thy blissful presence hereafter; there to join with the song of the seraphim in praising Thee, world without end. *Amen.*"

## ART. IV.—PREHISTORIC RACES OF THE UNITED STATES.\*

---

BY REV. J. H. DUBBS, A. M., PHILADELPHIA, PA.

---

"THE history of Antiquity," says Professor George Rawlinson, "requires to be from time to time re-written;" and this necessity that distinguished author has himself demonstrated by the production of his superb works on the great Oriental monarchies. Indeed, the history of the Mesopotamian empires has been recently not only re-written but entirely reconstructed. The remarkable discoveries of Layard, Botta, Flandin, and others, have been carefully studied by the most accomplished archæologists of Europe, and we are now fairly beginning to enjoy the results of their labors. The architecture and glyptic art of the Chaldeans, Assyrians and Babylonians have been scientifically examined and described; and "the best linguists of Europe have accepted the decipherment of the cuneiform inscriptions as a thing actually accomplished." Immense masses of historical facts have thus been placed at the disposal of the historian; and it is gratifying to the Christian scholar to be assured, that all these recent discoveries, when properly interpreted, illustrate and confirm the historical portions of the Old Testament Scriptures. Such men as Rawlinson do not hesitate to declare that their researches have but strengthened them in their faith that the Scripture history contains "the exact truth;"† and indeed it seems to be their highest object to bring a new tribute to their blessed Lord.

---

\* *Prehistoric Races of the United States of America.* By J. W. Foster, L.L.D. Author of the "Physical Geography of the Mississippi Valley;" Joint Author of Foster and Whitney's Report on the "Geology of the Lake Superior Region;" Late President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science; President of the Chicago Academy of Sciences, and member of the other Learned Societies. Chicago: S. C. Griggs and Company, London: Trübner & Co.

† Rawlinson's "Five Ancient Monarchies," Vol. I., p. 44.

While these researches have been so satisfactorily progressing in the remote East, another science, which claims to deal with objects of still higher antiquity, has come into existence in Western Europe. It is known as Prehistoric Archæology, and is said to be "the connecting link between Geology and History." Principally concerned with the remains of men of whom history has preserved no record, "it deals," according to Sir John Lubbock, "with times and events far more ancient than any which have yet fallen within the province of the archæologist." While it is to be regretted that many of the exponents of this new science fail to exhibit the reverential spirit of the Mesopotamian investigators, and that they frequently express themselves with a degree of boldness and confidence that is hardly compatible with a science which is confessed to be still in its infancy, the results of their researches are not therefore to be undervalued, and we cannot doubt that they will finally do good service to the cause of truth.

To those Americans who take an interest in the advancement of human knowledge it has long been a source of regret, that while such extensive researches are progressing in Europe and Asia so little has been done in the way of investigating the monuments of the prehistoric races of our own continent. The materials for such an undertaking appear to be abundant. All over the country the plow is constantly turning up the stone weapons of the aborigines; in the Western and Southern States there are thousands of earth-works, commonly called "mounds," which were evidently the work of a race far superior to the American Indians; while in Mexico and Central America there are extensive ruins which show a refined skill far superior to any of the existing monuments of the Aztec race, and at least equal to the architectural remains of the earliest Asiatic monarchies.

It is true that this interesting subject has not been entirely neglected. One of the earliest investigators was Caleb Atwater, who, if we remember correctly, expressed the opinion that he had so fully exhausted his theme that nothing more remained to be said. More recently a number of excellent memoirs, by

Squier and Davis, Lapham, and Haven, have been published under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution; but these are chiefly descriptive of ancient mounds and their contents, and were evidently intended by their respective authors to furnish material for further study. They are useful, as authorities; but they do not attempt to solve the problems which they raise. The same may be said of the works which describe the antiquities of Central America. Thus, Gen. Brantz Mayer—himself an eminent writer on American antiquities—remarks that “the graphic works of Mr. Stephens seem but to open new authorities upon this vast problem;” and even Mr. Stephens himself, while musing over the ruins of the ancient city of Copan, employs the following language:

“One thing I believe, that its history is graven on its monuments. No Champollion has yet brought to them the energies of his inquiring mind. Who shall read them?”

Chaos of ruins who shall trace the void—  
O'er the dim fragments cast a lunar light,  
And say, here *was*, or is—where all is doubly night?”

Such being the unsatisfactory state of our knowledge of American antiquities, we are ready to hail with pleasure the publication of any work which promises to augment the stock of our information, while at the same time it applies to these facts the tests of modern critical science. These conditions the work of Dr. Foster, on the “*Prehistoric Races of the United States of America*,” earnestly attempts to meet, and it is therefore worthy of high praise. It is, moreover, one of the most readable books of its kind, and its perusal has afforded us much pleasure.

We must, however, confess, that the title and scope of the work are too limited to meet the want which we have sought to indicate. The United States of America have not yet celebrated their centennial anniversary, and it therefore appears somewhat arbitrary to circumscribe the discussion by their boundaries. Besides, the author holds, and we think justly, that the mound-builders of the Mississippi Valley were the progenitors of the powerful Toltec race, who in all probability built the

great cities whose ruins still exist in the forests of Yucatan and Central America. Would it not then be better to study the remains of the Prehistoric Races, not only of the United States, but of all America, or at least of North America; in order that, by bringing together and comparing all these widely-scattered fragments, it might be possible, in some measure, to reconstruct a complete and harmonious whole?

Our author, however, does not appear to have undertaken his work with such an object; and he is evidently more fully imbued with the spirit of Lyell and Lubbock than with that of Layard and Rawlinson. Thoroughly enamored of the new science of Prehistoric Archæology, he would almost seem to regard the discovery of historic facts as of less importance than the demonstration of the immense antiquity of the human race. He, therefore, introduces his work with an extensive and well-written *résumé* of the recent investigations and alleged discoveries of the geologists and ethnologists of Europe and America, which are held to prove, that "man lived at a time too remote to be embraced in our received systems of chronology, surrounded by great quadrupeds which have ceased to exist, and under a climate very different from that which now prevails."

"Revelations so startling," our author continues, "have been received with disquietude and distrust by those who adhere to the chronology of Usher and Petavius." As, however, our faith is not based on mathematical calculations, we are not in the least disquieted, and can calmly follow him, as we have followed others, to the bone caves of France, the "kitchen-middings" of Denmark, and the lake dwellings of Switzerland, as well as to the alluvium of the Mississippi and the gold-drift of California. We cannot, of course, within our present limits, dwell at length on the discoveries and conclusions of recent investigators, as is done in the volume before us; but we are unable to resist the temptation of making a few remarks on this general subject. This we are the more ready to do, because, according to the historian Lenormant, "Prehistoric archæology is yet but in its infancy; it leaves great gaps and many problems without solution; and all its facts are not yet established with perfect certainty."

Our author quotes from several writers, who have differently divided the period of the prehistoric man, into several distinct ages or epochs. The most recent writers, however, we believe, generally speak of *three* ages. The first of these is the Stone age, when men were ignorant of the use of metals, and made exclusive use of implements and weapons made of stone. This age is subdivided into the Palæolithic period, when these instruments were rough and unpolished, and the Neolithic, or Polished stone period, "characterized by beautiful weapons and instruments, made of flint and other kinds of stone, in which, however, we find no trace of metals, excepting gold, which seems to have been sometimes used for ornaments." Secondly, we have "the Bronze age, in which bronze was used for arms and cutting instruments of all kinds; and, thirdly, the Iron age, in which that metal had superseded bronze for arms, axes, etc., though still to some extent employed for ornaments, and the handles of swords."

Sir John Lubbock, from whom we quote, without strictly following his order of periods, does not hesitate to appeal to the writers of antiquity in support of this theory of "the three ages." He quotes from Hesiod, Homer, and Lucretius; but it appears remarkable, to say the least, that he does not at this point refer to an authority which is far more ancient and important. In the book of Genesis it is stated, according to our version, that Tubal Cain was "an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron;" and though the passage has been held to mean no more than that he was "the inventor of weapons of bronze and iron," the natural inference would be, in either case, that there was once an Age of Stone, when metals were unknown. We see no reason for supposing, that mankind were always in possession of what have been called the arts of civilization; but there are, in fact, many statements in Scripture which seem to imply the direct contrary. The theory of a universal "Age of Stone" is, therefore, neither disquieting nor improbable, though until more of its remains are discovered in those countries which are generally regarded as the cradle of the human race, it would be premature to affirm it as absolutely certain.

Nor are we much affected by the statement, that man existed in Europe and America contemporaneously with the Mammoth, the cave-bear, and other extinct animals, especially as no one can fix the date when these animals became extinct. "The opinion has been put forward," says the author of "Life in the Primeval World," "that the great cat of the caves is identical with the lion which after the invasion of Xerxes disquieted, in Macedonia, the soldiers of the 'king of kings,' and that this lion still exists in certain secluded regions of Asia;" and, within the past few months, we have seen it stated that a Russian traveler categorically affirms, that he has seen the Mammoth, alive and well, in the wilds of Siberia. Whatever such assertions may be worth, there is nothing to disprove the existence of these animals within a period of three or four thousand years at the utmost.\*

Personally, we feel the force of many of the arguments, by which our Prehistoric archaeologists seek to prove the antiquity of man; and, indeed, the fact that human relics are found in geologic formations, which we are accustomed to regard as exceedingly ancient, would seem to render it almost certain, that man has existed, both in Europe and America, for a much longer period than we had hitherto supposed. Still, we must not forget that there are some men, not ignorant of science, who insist that it is impossible to estimate correctly the age of a geologic formation; because we lack an essential element of the computation, the necessary "uniformity of factor." Such, at least, is the opinion of Prof. Rogers, and other writers, as quoted at length in the recently published book, of the Rev. Ebenezer Burgess, on "The Antiquity and Unity of the Human Race."

We have lingered too long, with our author on the threshold of his subject, and therefore hasten to the consideration

---

\*"Among the animals found, which furnished food for the neolithic dwellers in Caithness, was the Reindeer. The existence of this animal in Scotland, as late as the year 1159, is incidentally mentioned in the Orkneyinga Saga, in which year the Jarls of Orkney, Ronald and Harold, are said to have crossed over into Caithness, from Orkney to hunt that animal. We are glad to see that Sir John Lubbock has admitted, in his last edition, that this notice in the Sagas is probably true."—*British Quarterly Review*, 1872.



of that portion of his book, which appears to us to be peculiarly interesting and valuable. We have here a full description of the relics of the Mound-builders, who at one time occupied the Mississippi valley, the Gulf Coast, and the region of the Great Lakes. "These relics," says Dr. Foster, "consist of tumuli symmetrically raised, and often enclosed in mathematical figures, such as the square, the octagon, and circle, with long lines of circumvallation; of pits in the solid rocks, and rubbish heaps formed in the prosecution of their mining operations; and of a variety of utensils, wrought in stone or copper, or moulded in clay, which evince a knowledge of art and methodical labor, foreign to the Red man. While the character of these structures, as traced over wide areas, differs in minor particulars, still there is a general uniformity which stamps the authors as one people, and subjects of one controlling government."

Our author begins by describing the ancient works of the North West, among which the so-called "animal mounds" of Wisconsin are the most remarkable. These differ so widely from the mounds found in other parts of the country, that they have been supposed to have been constructed by a different race; but are now, in consequence of certain general resemblances, believed to have had a common origin. Instead of being circular or pyramidal, they generally consist of gigantic imitations of animate objects, such as buffaloes, bears, foxes, wolves, lizards, turtles and birds, and sometimes the human form is unmistakably portrayed. "These animal forms attain no great elevation, their height varying from one to four feet above the surrounding prairie; nor are they in all instances thrown up as basso-relievos, but are sometimes represented as intaglios." Only two instances of this kind of mound, are mentioned as occurring outside of the state of Wisconsin, and both of these are in Ohio. The "Great Serpent," in Adams county, is described by Squier and Davis, as having "its head conforming to the crest of a hill, and its body winding back for seven hundred feet, in graceful undulations, terminating in a triple coil at the tail;" and the "Alligator," in Lick-

ing county, whose length "from the point of the nose following the curves of the tail to the tip, is about 250 feet, the breadth of the body 40 feet, and the length of the legs, or paws, each 36 feet." It is, of course, impossible to explain the object of these structures, but it seems most natural to suppose that they had, in some way, a religious significance.

Far more numerous are the circular mounds, and great embankments of the valley of the Mississippi. "Not only are the banks of the Ohio, at frequent intervals, crowned by these structures, but those of the subordinate streams, such as the Wabash, the Scioto, the Miami, and the Muskingum, entering from the north; and those from the opposite side, such as the Kanawhas, the Cumberland and the Tennessee. The number of tumuli in Ohio alone, is estimated by the authors before referred to (Squier and Davis) at ten thousand, and the number of enclosures at from one thousand to fifteen hundred. Ross county, of which Chillicothe is the capital, contains one hundred enclosures and five hundred mounds."

Of course, among so vast a number of tumuli, there are almost innumerable variations in size and form. The largest was probably the great mound of Cahokia, which before it was swept away, by modern improvements, occupied an area of about six acres. Others there are, whose dimensions are not greatly inferior. Then we have long lines of embankments, in some instances having the appearance of ordinary breast-works, while in others they form intricate geometrical figures, whose purpose it is now impossible even to surmise. Very frequently, however, the object of these enclosures was plainly defensive, and it is a remarkable fact, that they "are most conspicuous along what may be called the frontier of the Alleghanies, and disappear altogether as we enter the immediate valley of the Mississippi, which contains the most stupendous of the mounds." Indeed, Squier and Davis go so far as to affirm, that there was a regular system of defences, extending from the sources of the Alleghany and Susquehanna, in New York, diagonally across the country, through Central and Northern Ohio, to the Wabash. This would seem to indicate the presence of danger

in that direction, and to render probable the Ancient Mexican tradition, that the Toltecs were driven southward by a barbarous people, coming from the North-east, who were perhaps identical with our American Indians.

The mounds are described as being of four varieties: sacrificial mounds, temple-sites, sepulchral mounds, and mounds of observation. The sacrificial mounds contain an altar of stones or burnt clay, on which are found the charred remains of human bones. This would seem to indicate either that the mound builders practiced *cremation*, or that they offered up human sacrifices. The existence of apparently contemporary sepulchral mounds, in which the remains of the dead, are found buried with the utmost care, as well as the undoubted fact, that the Aztecs frequently sacrificed human victims as late as the time of the Spanish conquest, incline us to accept the latter hypothesis, though our author would seem to be of the opposite opinion.

Among the most interesting of the mounds, are those which appear to have been constructed as sites for temples, which in consequence of the perishable materials of which they were composed, have now entirely disappeared. "They generally consist of pyramidal structures, truncated, and generally having graded avenues to their tops," thus bearing a strong resemblance to the Teocallis of Mexico and Central America, which however were faced with flights of steps, and surmounted by temples of stone. Our author very justly combats the notion of those who see in these truncated pyramids, evidences of Egyptian origin. "The pyramids," he says, "like the temple mounds, were used for sepulchres, but here the analogy ends. The mound-builders burned the bodies of the dead, or left them to be resolved into dust by the slow process of decay; but the Egyptians believing that the soul would again tenant the body, resorted to expensive processes for its preservation.

The same remarks will apply when we institute a comparison between the Teocallis of Central America, and the Pyramids. They differ both in the mode of construction and in the object aimed at. The Pyramids are complete in them-

selves, and as they tower up in the Nile Valley, the eye at once takes in the coherence of the several parts. The Teocallis form but a part of the general plan,—they were but the foundations for more elaborate structures. ‘There is no pyramid,’ in Egypt, says Stevens, ‘with a palace or temple upon it; there is no pyramidal structure in this country without.’ The pyramids, according to Herodotus, were originally coated with stone from base to summit; the Teocallis have flattened summits, with flights of steps descending to the base.” It seems plain, therefore, that the mound builders did not copy from Egyptian models. There is, indeed, a much greater similarity between the Teocallis and the Chaldean *Zigurats*, which are generally supposed to have been surmounted by shrines or small temples; but even here the resemblance can hardly be supposed to be otherwise than accidental.

We cannot, of course, within our present limits, follow our author through his interesting account of the mound system of the West; and must refer those of our readers, who are interested in the subject to the book itself.

The relics of the Mound-builders plainly show, that they were not a civilized people in the modern sense of the term. They were still in the age of Stone, though during the latter portion of their history, emerging into an age of Copper. The skill manifested in the construction of their stone implements is, however, truly remarkable. We have not only the ordinary arrow-heads, which have been made by barbarous tribes all over the world, but innumerable other implements, from rude spades and axes to highly polished statuettes, which are held in some instances, to reproduce the features of the race. They understood the art of weaving, for not only are shuttles, and other portions of the apparatus, frequently discovered, but portions of the texture itself, regularly spun, and woven with a warp and woof, have been recovered from the mounds. In the plastic arts, the mound-builders are said to have attained a degree of perfection far in advance of the Stone and Bronze periods in Europe. Lubbock says that “few of the British sepulchral urns, belonging to the ante-Roman times, have upon

them any curved lines." The urns and vases of the Mound-builders, on the contrary, were very generally ornamented with curved lines and fretwork, and sometimes with the figures of animals or of human beings. Indeed, even in Eastern Pennsylvania, which is generally supposed to have been outside of the territory of the Mound-builders, the writer has found fragments of pottery which must originally have been exceedingly beautiful.

One of the most interesting chapters, in the volume before us, is devoted to the ancient mining for copper in the region of Lake Superior. It was found by modern miners that they had been anticipated by the aborigines. Immense excavations, together with large numbers of stone hammers and other implements, employed in mining, abundantly testify to the industry and perseverance of a prehistoric race. "To connect the copper-mines with the mound-builders," says our author, "is no difficult task. Copper wrought into various utensils, is found in the mounds all the way from Wisconsin to the Gulf Coast, and the supply is too abundant to authorize the supposition that it was derived from the boulder drift. Its wide distribution is an evidence, too, of an extensive commerce. To penetrate that distant region from the Ohio valley, involved on the part of the Mound-builders a voyage of a thousand miles. The passage to and fro was made in the summer season, for there is no evidence, such as mounds, village plots, or house foundations, to indicate permanent occupancy. The climate is too hyperborean to admit of the maturing of maize, and hence they must have had a well-organized commissariat, with no interruption in their lines of communication. It is true, the lakes and streams afforded an abundance of fish of the finest flavor; but man cannot thrive on a fish diet alone."

Other mining operations were conducted in regions equally remote. Mica was brought from North Carolina, and the stones most desirable for the manufacture of their implements were obtained from special quarries. Indeed, in reviewing the arts and manufactures of the Mound-builders, it becomes plain that they were a peaceable and industrious race, who were

rapidly advancing in civilization, when they were conquered by a more vigorous but less intelligent people.

Beyond these facts, and certain peculiarities of cranial development, which mark them as a distinct race, we know little or nothing concerning this Prehistoric nation. Their origin will probably remain veiled in obscurity. It has been suggested, that they were the Lost Tribes of Israel; and the Abbé Brasseur boldly asserts, that they were originally inhabitants of the mythical island of Atlantis, which is supposed to have disappeared beneath the waters of the Atlantic Ocean; but we need hardly remind the reader that there is no proof to substantiate these wild hypotheses. Our author is inclined, on much better grounds, to refer their origin to "that race who, in times far remote, flourished in Brazil, some of whose crania are found in the bone-caves of Minas Geraes, in connection with mammalian bones belonging to genera and species now extinct."

Concerning the later history of the mound-builders, we know absolutely nothing but what is related in the Mexican traditions, to which we have already referred. The Toltecs, who seem to have been their descendants, are said to have emigrated from a country to the north-east, whence they were driven by the Chichimecs—a name applied to all the barbarous tribes of the New World—who were all united under one great leader. After thirteen years of fearful conflict, they abandoned their country and marched southward. Two chiefs guided the march of the emigrating nation, and after remaining several years in a region near the sea, "they at length reached Mexico, where they built a town called Tollanzinco, and later the city of Tullan, which became the seat of their government."

The date of these occurrences it would seem impossible to determine. Prescott, in his "Conquest of Mexico," supposes that the Toltecs "entered the territory of Anahuac probably before the close of the seventh century;" while our author asserts, on the authority of the Abbé Brasseur, that "their migration must have begun more than a thousand years before the Christian era." Such diversity of opinion, it must be confessed, argues no small degree of uncertainty. "After a period

of four centuries," says Prescott,\* "the Toltecs, who had extended their sway over the remotest borders of Anahuac, having been greatly reduced, it is said, by famine, pestilence and unsuccessful wars, disappeared from the land as silently and mysteriously as they had entered it. A few of them still lingered behind, but much the greater number, probably, spread over the region of Central America, and the neighboring isles; and the traveller now speculates on the majestic ruins of Mitla and Palenque, as possibly the work of this extraordinary people."

The Aztecs, who succeeded and probably conquered the Toltecs, entered the valley of Mexico not more than three hundred years before the Norman Conquest. Our author asserts that "they were not barbarians, but like the Goths in invading the Roman empire, were disposed to adopt the arts, the civilization, and even the religion of the conquered. The older ruins show a refined skill which was not attained in those of a more modern date; and the picture-writing on the Aztec monuments fails to interpret the inscriptions of Palenque and Copan." Elsewhere he says: "The Aztec system of writing, while symbolical, was carried to a higher development (than the picture-writing of the North American Indian), and separate words were indicated. It became a species of mnemonics, intelligible only to the initiated, and incapable of a literal interpretation. The hieroglyphics displayed upon the walls of Copan, in horizontal or perpendicular rows, would indicate a written language, in which the pictorial significance had largely disappeared, and a kind of word-writing had become predominant. Intermingled with the pictorial devices are apparently purely arbitrary characters, which may be alphabetic. This, however, may be said, that in the Central American hieroglyphics we have a highly artificial system of writing, to interpret which the Aztec picture writing affords no aid."

It will be seen, then, that the difficulty of deciphering the Toltec inscriptions is so great as to appear insurmountable. There would seem to be not a single clue by which the mystery

---

\* "Conquest of Mexico," vol. I. pp. 13-14.



might possibly be unraveled. The true student, however, does not willingly say, impossible. He cannot forget the decipherment of the Egyptian hieroglyphics and of the cuneiform inscriptions of Assyria. If the Aztec civilization was grafted on the Toltec, there was probably a time, when, under a well organized government, it was found necessary to issue edicts in two languages, and hence the possibility of bilingual inscriptions, such as those which rendered possible the discoveries of Oriental investigators. Hitherto the antiquities of Central America have failed to receive the degree of attention which they seem to deserve. Is it impossible, therefore, that a thorough scientific investigation should be rewarded with the discovery of an American Rosetta-stone, that might aid scholars, conversant with the modern dialects spoken in the vicinity, in discovering the significance of these mysterious hieroglyphics?

We still hope, with Stephens, though it is a forlorn hope, at best, that "some Champollion" may yet arise, who will succeed in reading the story of the Prehistoric Races of America. Then, but not till then, may we expect to receive authentic information concerning the history of the mound-builders, the account of whose monuments and artistic achievements, in Dr. Foster's valuable work, has afforded us so much pleasure and instruction.

## ART. V.—TRUE CONVERSION AND RELIGIOUS EXPERIENCE.

BY REV. CALVIN S. GERHARD, A. M., SUNBURY, PA.

THE word, in the original language of the New Testament, translated conversion, is *ἐπιστροφή*, and occurs only once. The verb *ἐπιστρέφω*, from which the noun is derived, is used nine times. Several times the verb is found without the prefix *ἐπι*, when its primary signification is *to turn*. With the prefix, it means *to turn towards*. This signification the word retains in every instance, in which it is used in the New Testament. But the turning itself is not always just the same; that is, the word is used in different senses, and the sense in any particular passage, can only be determined by the context.

Closely allied to the word conversion is another Scriptural term, namely; repentance, the noun for which in the original is *μετάνοια*. This term, with the various forms of the verb *μετανοέω*, from which the noun is derived, occurs quite frequently, and several times in immediate connection with some form of the word conversion. The primary meaning of the verb *μετανοέω* is *to change one's mind*. Its signification is therefore akin to that of conversion. The word conversion primarily denotes an outward change, whilst the word repentance designates an inward change, a change of mind. The word mind in this connection, however, cannot refer to the intellect simply, so that a change of mind would be a change of opinion only, but the term repentance denoting a change of mind, is made to stand for a change of the whole inner man, including the soul and spirit.

Now in Protestant Theology, as this comes to view both in the Reformed and Lutheran confessions of the sixteenth century, the word conversion is generally used to express the meaning of the two words, repentance and conversion taken

together. Hence in the original of the 88th Question of the Heidelberg Catechism repentance and conversion are used as synonymous terms. The question is put thus: "In how many things does true repentance or conversion consist?" Taking then the original meaning of both words, conversion is properly defined first of all as a turning toward and a change of mind; the turning and change of mind having of course reference to sin and Satan on the one hand, and to God in Christ Jesus on the other.

We understand now the meaning of the term conversion, but what is the fact itself for which the word stands? As a real inward change it is first a change of the will, and of the affections, and then as the result of this, a change of life. What then is the will? The power of self-determination. But man is a finite being, and none of his powers are absolute. They are all relative. His power of self-determination is therefore not absolute but only relative. A finite will is only partially self-determining. Consciously or unconsciously, our wills are always under the control of a will stronger and broader than the individual human will. Consciously or unconsciously our individual wills either move freely within the sphere of the generic will of God, or are slavishly under the control of the despotic will of the devil. The god of this world, the prince of the power of the air, Satan, is able to sway, and does sway the will of every natural man. The will of such a one is not simply held in bondage by his perverted passions, and evil propensities, but by Satan himself. Hence the devil is in the Scriptures called the prince, and the god, of this world. For, back of every form of wickedness, in all the wide world, is the arch rebel himself, the father of lies, who is not only the author of sin but also constantly kindles it afresh. This holds true not only of adults, but just as much also of infants. We are all conceived and born in sin. The incipient will, and together with it, because the will is the deepest element of our human life, the whole being of the child when it is born is under the power of sin and the devil. From the very beginning, therefore, the development of the child is

abnormal and false. And this is the reason that the promise is to us *and* to our *children*. The blessings of the covenant reach down as deep as sin and the curse, and in their baptism the grace of the actualized covenant, or Christian Church, as the mystical body of Christ is signed, sealed and thus made over to infants. Baptized in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost for the remission of sins, they receive the gift of the Holy Ghost as the Medium through whom the glorified Christ, His Divine human life, and all His merits are received.

In their baptism, therefore, is not only the regeneration of infants germinally effected, but there their conversion begins. There it begins, and as a beginning may slumber for years; and it may ultimately die out altogether, even as the twig, though properly grafted into the tree, may droop, and finally die. The continuance of children's conversion after they have been received into the covenant of grace depends first upon those who have them in charge; afterwards upon themselves, their instructors and surroundings. As the child becomes self-conscious and begins to exercise its will, it always does so in harmony with the will of God, or in subjection to the will of the devil. And just in the degree in which it resists Satan, and yields to God through His Holy Spirit, will its conversion go forward. Now what is true of a child is also true of adults. Conversion consists primarily in a change of the will. And we are being converted, accordingly, just in the degree in which we do not yield to sin and Satan, but submit our wills to the will of God. But how do we come to know the will of God? Through the conscience and reason, enlightened by His Word and Spirit. And how do we know the will of Satan? Whatever contradicts the will of God is the will of Satan. He lives in constant rebellion against God. Whatever therefore is contrary to the dictates of conscience and the decision of the reason, properly enlightened by the Word and Spirit of God, that is sinful and that is the will of the devil. But just as the conscience and the reason must be enlightened to properly know the will of God, so must the will itself be strengthened to do

the will of God. This is precisely what the Holy Ghost does for every one who yields to His gentle wooings. He gives strength to every child of the covenant in whose heart Christ dwells by faith to will that which is good. But although the will lies at the foundation of our personal existence, it does not at once carry along with it the whole man; as says the Apostle, Rom. vii. 18-23, "To will is present with me, but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man. But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members."

Taking this profound view of the subject it immediately becomes evident that true conversion cannot be a sudden change effected once for all. It includes in itself at least three distinct stages, one of which is frequently mistaken, and more frequently still its counterfeit only, for the whole of conversion.

The first stage of conversion begins when the child is introduced into the covenant of grace, and a counteracting influence is set to work, through the gracious powers contained in the covenant, in the original bent of its nature. The grace of baptism is not the antidote exactly of original sin, but the germinal possibility rather through which this evil tendency in our nature may be gradually overcome, and finally altogether rooted out. The unfolding of the life germ implanted in baptism, is the development of principial regeneration into the new man, and the effect which flows from this development is conversion. This double process goes forward like every other phase of Christian life, just in the degree in which there is living faith in Christ either on the part of the child itself, or on the part of some one for the child as long as it cannot itself exercise conscious faith. Christ exercises His saving power, and thus dwells in our hearts, only by faith. Unconscious in-

infants have capacity to receive the implanted germ of a new life, but do not furnish the conditions for its growth. What light, heat and moisture are to the grain of wheat, deposited in good soil, that living faith is to the infant regenerated by the Holy Ghost in baptism. Or more pertinently still, what the love, care and attention of the mother, through whom God feeds, clothes, and shelters the infant child, are to its natural life, that living faith on the part of pious parents is to its regenerate life. We must therefore believe for our children, as long as they cannot believe for themselves if we desire the grace of God to unfold in them. Truly pious parents who pray for their children, and are as much concerned about *their* growth in grace, as they are about their own, are the only parents who can properly claim that they are bringing up their children, in the way they should go. Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God. As soon as the child is old enough to hear the Word of God, and partially understand it, it must be taught that Word, which is Christ, and for the child, the infant Jesus. All this will impress the child and work faith in its own heart, and as it grows in age it will also grow in grace. This will be for the child a real turning to God, and thus also a real turning from sin and Satan. This is the first stage of conversion, and leads the way to the second stage.

The second stage is entered upon, when the regenerate life of the believer so pervades the will that it is subdued, and the subject of grace as a new man gives himself up freely, and consciously to God in Jesus Christ through the Holy Ghost. Hence before the second stage of conversion is reached, there must be for some time a conscious or unconscious moving, toward the inevitable issue. Sometimes the crisis, when it is really entered upon, as in the case of Luther, involves a terrible struggle. Sometimes, too, the change is so gradual that the subject passes imperceptibly from a state of rebellion, or merely passive obedience, into a state of active obedience to God in Christ. But whether the change be accompanied by a violent struggle or not, the thing itself is essential. Every adult that

would be saved, must be brought to that point where he will no longer be in a state of rebellion against God, or simply passively obey the Lord, but when he will freely and consciously determine himself in harmony with the will of God. At this period in the life of the believing subject of grace, when by the power of faith he is brought to determine himself freely, and consciously in harmony with the will of God, his justification, which was effected essentially in his baptism, takes place actually, and consists in his full judicial reception into the favor of God through Christ; the ethical approval of God, authenticating itself to his believing heart. This free, conscious self-surrender cannot be made for us by others. This each one must make for himself through the Holy Ghost, who is given to us for this very purpose.

The third stage of conversion is reached when, having fully surrendered ourselves to Christ, we enter earnestly upon the work of subduing the law of sin in our members, the assaults of the world and Satan; and of consecrating ourselves continually to Christ, and working for Him in His kingdom. With this stage begins our sanctification, in which the new man, having conquered the citadel of the soul and obtained a full surrender to himself of the old man, enters upon the work of cleansing and purification. The will and the heart are now right, but there are evil tendencies, corrupt inclinations and vicious habits to be overcome through the positive activity of the regenerate life of the believer, now moving freely and consciously into fuller union with the life of God. As this process goes forward, our sanctification progresses and our conversion becomes continually more complete, but is never fully consummated in this world.

Thus far we have considered, mainly the change which the will undergoes in the work of true conversion. But along with a change of the will, and not simply followed by it, goes also a change of the affections and a change of life. The heart is the seat of the affections. Out of it come love and hatred. The natural man loves the pleasures of sin, and hates the law and commandments of God. In the process of conversion our hearts are renewed. We learn to hate the



pleasures of sin, and to delight in the law of God after the inward man. Nay, more than this. We come to hate all sin because of its very nature, and learn to love God in Christ more and more fully. The love of God is shed abroad in our hearts. By faith we hold real communion and fellowship with Christ. Our hearts grow warm with love to Him. We delight to do His will, and it becomes our greatest pleasure to please Him. This affects us in all the relations of life, and will cause us to hate all evil and to delight in good works, which will then necessarily bring about a change of life. Conversion is correctly defined therefore as not only a change of the will, but as a change also of the affections, as well as a change of life.

It is necessary that we now consider and justify the sense in which the word conversion is used in this article. This is very important, as there is perhaps no word in the English language that is more abused than the term conversion. It is on every one's lips, and yet very few persons stop to think what it means. This produces endless confusion and occasions much mischief. Most persons have a very vague idea as to what conversion really is, and imagine that it is brought about through a peculiar experience, which the Holy Spirit produces in the heart, when at the right moment, He takes sudden possession of it. The Spirit is regarded as effecting a sudden, sensible change, which takes place in an instant and is accomplished once for all. But this doctrine is a fiction, only this and nothing more; a false doctrine, not verified either by Scripture or by the history of the Church, as this embodies the faith once delivered to the saints. It is a new doctrine, scarcely a hundred years old; a doctrine which contradicts the faith and teachings of the Church in all ages; and what is new in this sense cannot be true. As a pernicious principle it was born, and commenced to work as an evil leaven when men put asunder that which God hath joined together; when men forgot that the Church, as the mystical Body of Christ, into which fallen men are received that they may be saved, is necessarily visible and invisible as one organic constitution, even as man himself, a concrete entity uniting in himself the natural and

spiritual worlds, is visible and invisible, and taught that the Church is not thus two-fold in its character, but that there are two Churches, the visible Church and the invisible Church. Through the rise of Puritanism, the principle worked itself into a theory, and in Methodism and Baptistism, has been carried out to its farthest possible extreme as a doctrine. This doctrine of instantaneous conversion we reject as false, because, as already said, it cannot be verified by the Scriptures and the history of the Christian Church. It entirely contradicts the teachings of the New Testament. It does this in altogether ignoring the Holy Sacraments as means of grace. Men are, according to this theory, regenerated, converted and perfected without receiving any grace through the Sacraments. But what do Christ and His apostles say? "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." (John iii. 5.) Again: "And He said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach my Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is *baptized* shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned." (Mark xvi. 15, 16.) "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth. Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." (Matt. xxviii. 18, 20).

We have here the instructions which the Saviour gave to His Apostles as to the manner in which they should carry forward in His Name, the work which He had commenced. On the day of Pentecost after the Holy Ghost had been poured out, and the apostles were "endued with power from on high," (Luke xxiv. 49), St. Peter commenced the work which had been entrusted to him and to the other apostles. He preached the Gospel to the Jews who had crucified Jesus Christ, and assured them that "God hath made this same Jesus both Lord and Christ." Some of His hearers were convinced of the truth of what He said. They believed, and "were pricked in their heart, and said unto Peter and to the rest of the apostles,

Men and Brethren, *what shall we do?*" What was St. Peter's infallible answer guided now by the Spirit into all truth? (John xvi. 13). Because of the peculiar circumstances under which this answer was given, it is very important. What then did the inspired Apostle say to these Jews who had been brought to exercise some degree of faith and desired to be forgiven and saved? "Then Peter said unto them, Repent and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. For the promise is unto you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call."

"Then they that gladly received His word were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. And the Lord added to the Church daily, such as should be saved." (Acts ii. 37-40, 41 and 47).

We will select a few other passages from the large number, that might be quoted. "And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." (Acts xxii. 16). "Ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ." (Gal. iii. 26, 27). "Know ye not, that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, were baptized into His death? Therefore we are buried with Him by baptism into death: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." (Rom. vi. 3, 4). "The like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us (not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God,) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ." (1 Peter iii. 21).

What! Has baptism indeed nothing to do with our regeneration and conversion? Do not rather Christ and His Apostles plainly teach us, that we are to regard His grace as actually ours not before we become members of His Church, but only afterwards? What else can the passages of Scripture just quoted

mean, but that salvation comes to us through the Church, the Body of Christ, into which we are by faith engrafted through the initiatory sacrament of baptism? Any theory, therefore, which has no need of baptism to effect regeneration and true conversion, contradicts the whole tenor of the New Testament.

An important truth, however, underlies the false doctrine to which we have referred. The doctrine is based on the necessity of a personal awakening in the case of every unawakened adult who desires salvation, and lays great stress on the truth that any one who has come to the years of discretion, to be saved, must realize that he is a sinner by nature and practice, and heartily believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. This is possible not only in the case of those who are in the Church, but also in the case of those who are outside. Unbaptized persons can be awakened, can be brought to a knowledge of their sins and misery, and can believe in Christ. This much is possible in virtue of prevenient grace coming to them through the Holy Ghost. This however is not conversion itself, but only the necessary condition which leads to it; for, of course, no one makes any real attempt to turn to God in Christ, unless he realizes his sin and misery, believes in Jesus as the Christ, the Son of God, and comforts himself, because of the conviction that Christ died and rose again, not only for others, but also for him. This leads the unbaptized penitent sinner to submit to baptism and confirmation whereby he is received into the full communion of the Church and receives the Holy Ghost as the Bearer and Dispenser of the life of Christ and all His merits. Baptized into Jesus Christ he is *born* of water and the Spirit. He enters a new order of life. He is made to have part in the life of Christ as really as by his natural birth he has part in the life of Adam. He now occupies the same position which the baptized child has occupied from its earliest infancy, and in the degree in which by the power of faith he surrenders his will to the will of God, learns to love Him more fully, and changes his whole course of life is his old Adamic nature taken up by his regenerate life, and his conversion thus continually goes forward, but is never completed in this life.

So the Reformers looked upon conversion and so it is set forth in the Heidelberg Catechism. The Catechism regards conversion as a process reaching from the moment of regeneration forward to the close of the Christian's life on earth. "In regeneration the personality is centrally and principally renewed, but the law of sin still exists in the periphery of its nature, so that the appetites, desires, inclinations and passions are still more or less under its dominion. This is that law of sin in the members; warring against the law of the spiritually renewed mind, or against the 'law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus;' which has become the determining principle of the mind. Here there is a conflict. The old and the new are contrary to each other. But the old is to be more and more absorbed by the new, or converted into the new, in such way however that it loses its own properties and qualities and puts on those of the new. Thus the new must grow at the expense of the old, until the old has been wholly abolished and the new has become all in all. The Catechism calls this entire process conversion or repentance." For, apprehended of Christ Jesus through the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Ghost the true believer fixes his eye of faith steadfastly on Jesus Christ, and "with open face beholding as in a glass the glory of the Lord is changed into the same image from glory to glory." The mystery of godliness opens more and more fully to his vision, but he cannot fathom or comprehend its exceeding greatness and glory. Continually he turns to it if that he may apprehend that for which also he is apprehended of Christ Jesus, and, like the Apostle Paul, says with deep humility, "I count not myself to have apprehended; but this one thing I do, forgetting those things which are behind, and reaching forth unto those which are before, I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus."

Is it then improper to speak of true believers as converted? Certainly not. For that which is not yet completed is frequently spoken of in the Sacred Scriptures as already consummated, when the concrete process only has been entered upon which makes the desired result not only possible, but also probable.

Whoever in his life of grace has passed into the second stage of conversion, when, as has been seen, the regenerate life of the believer so pervades the will that it is subdued, and the subject of grace as a new man gives himself up freely and consciously to God in Jesus Christ through the Holy Ghost, he may be properly said to be converted. Such an one's heart is turned from sin and Satan to God in Christ, and he may be said to be converted, although he is still very imperfect and needs to advance in grace and holiness as long as he lives. He is converted, but needs to be ever more fully converted.

There is no contradiction in this statement, neither is the view here expressed peculiar. It was taught by the Reformers of the sixteenth century and is maintained by the authors of the Heidelberg Catechism. Ursinus in his commentary on the Catechism asks the question: "Is conversion perfect in this life?" and answers it thus: "Our conversion to God is not perfect in this life, but it is here continually advancing until it reaches the perfection which is proposed in the life to come. All the complaints and prayers of the saints are confirmations of this truth. 'Cleanse thou me from secret faults.' 'O wretched man that I am who shall deliver me from the body of this death?'" Immediately after this it is said: "The same thing may be said of the exhortations of the prophets and Apostles, in which they exhort those who *are converted* to turn more fully unto God." It is also added: "There are two plain reasons why the will, in the case of those who *are converted*, tends imperfectly to the good in this life." The author gives these reasons, makes some further statements, and then closes his remarks with the following strong passage from Calvin's Institutes, in confirmation of his position that our conversion is not perfect in this life, although true believers are properly spoken of as converted. "This restoration is not accomplished in a single moment, or day, or year; but by continual, and sometimes even slow advances, the Lord destroys the carnal corruptions of His chosen, purifies them from all pollution and consecrates them as temples to Himself; renewing all their senses to real purity, that they may employ their whole life in

the exercise of *repentance*, and know that this warfare will be terminated only in death."

The religious experience which accompanies true conversion depends to a very great extent on the temperament, disposition and surroundings of the person who is being converted. There may be a general or even a very striking resemblance in the experience of the subjects of conversion, but there is always some difference. It is never precisely alike in any two persons. There is a general resemblance between all human beings, and yet no two look precisely alike. Whilst there is an indissoluble unity running through the human family there is also infinite variety. We differ in temperament, disposition, inclination, habit, age, education, intelligence, surroundings, and in all the circumstances of life. Christianity does not remove our individual peculiarities, in so far as they are not sinful, but only sanctifies them. There is endless variety in human life, therefore endless variety in Christian life. To compare our experience may at times be edifying, but the experience of one person cannot be made the test of true religion in others. The Apostles were all true believers in Christ, except Judas, and yet their faith manifested itself in a peculiar manner in the case of each one.

But this infinite variety of religious experience, as already intimated, does not destroy its inner unity. For running through all the peculiarities of religious experience there is a deeper peculiarity which distinguishes the genuine from the counterfeit. This peculiarity it is, however, very often extremely difficult to detect, and for this reason experience is never by itself a good test of the presence and power of true Christianity either in ourselves or others. God alone knoweth the heart. We do not even fully know our own hearts, much less the hearts of others. And just here it is that many persons make a grave mistake. A particular experience is to them the only proof of genuine Christianity, and the principal incentive to piety. This makes their Christianity partial and one-sided. It becomes too subjective. They look too much into themselves and not enough at Christ. They understand the words, "The Spirit itself



bearth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God," to refer, and exclusively too, to the emotions and spiritual pleasures which true believers experience. But how are we to tell whether these emotions and spiritual enjoyments are genuine or counterfeit? If so much depends on these, faith must of course turn in upon itself, examine itself and ascertain whether the Spirit thus witnessing be the spirit of truth or delusion. But in this way the testimony of the Spirit is rendered so hard to be discerned, that it does not help us at all, but our assurance in the end is made to depend only on our own certain knowledge of the genuineness of our experience. This leads the earnest inquirer to look away from Christ to himself, and what he desires is faith in his faith in Christ. His whole effort is to believe that he is believing in Christ. But how is he to gain such confidence in his faith in Christ? He must have some evidence on account of which he is willing to believe that he is a true believer. And this evidence he thinks must be in his feelings. He wants to *feel* that his sins are forgiven, and that God has accepted him; and then he is willing to regard himself as a true believer. Hence it is very common for persons who look at Christianity in this way to ask others this question: "Have you experienced religion?" By which question they mean this; "Did you ever feel anything in your mind and heart on account of which you believe that you are a Christian?" The answer of many professing Christians is this: "Yes, at such a time I was brought under conviction. I felt myself to be a great sinner. I prayed to the Lord to have mercy on me. I struggled fearfully, but at last on such a day I was blessed. I felt that the Lord had now forgiven my sins, and I was very happy. On this experience I base my hope, and because God gave it to me I believe myself to be a Christian and try to live like one."

This test of personal religion is the direct opposite of a dead formalism, which regards Christianity as made up of outward observances. Formalism is the one extreme, and the form of religion just described, or Pietism, as it is called, is the other extreme. Formalism causes men to be satisfied with an outward religion. Pietism turns men in upon themselves, and makes

them anxious to feel right : and their feelings then become the test and measure of their religion. Now although these two extremes directly contradict each other, they are precisely alike in one respect. They both ignore Christ. Formalism seeks comfort in rites, ceremonies, observances, and ordinances, sundered from Christ. Pietism seeks comfort in experience, in feeling, in the emotions, without any regard to the means of grace. Both these forms of Christianity are unfaithful to Christ, and whoever falls into either one of them is guilty of unbelief. And just this, namely ; unbelief, is the besetting sin of very many sincere inquirers after the truth. Instead of looking to Christ, taking Him at His word, pondering His gracious promises and simply trusting Him for all needed grace and help, they are constantly forgetting Him. If they succeed in procuring what they regard as the proper experience, then are they willing to believe that they are Christians and try to live like Christians, but not until then.

Now this is manifestly the perversion of an important truth. For the experience of religion is not the cause of personal Christianity and true piety, but the effect of these. A man is not a Christian because he has "experienced religion," but because he is a true Christian he has religious experience. A man does not become a Christian by being simply brought under conviction, by feeling himself to be a great sinner, by praying, and struggling with his sins, and then experiencing a feeling of comfort, else there were no occasion or necessity for the Holy Sacraments as means of grace, and yet these ordinances are prominently set forth as such by the Saviour and His Apostles. Something more than the experience just described is necessary to make a man a Christian. Of course any one who has not from his childhood been turning to, believing in, and loving the Lord Jesus Christ, but has led a careless, wicked, selfish, sinful life must be awakened, must be brought to a knowledge of his sin and misery, and must turn to the Lord with all his heart, which act of faith will bring comfort to his soul. But this does not in itself make a person a Christian any more than true love between a man and a woman marries them, makes them man and

wife. Something in addition to true love is necessary to make a man a husband and a woman a wife. They must be married.

What then is it that makes us true Christians? Not our religious feelings, and pious emotions, but life union with Jesus Christ. How is this brought about and maintained? Neither through mental and spiritual exercises, nor through outward observances, but by faith and prayer in the use of the means of grace—the Word of God and the Holy Sacraments. The Lord Jesus Christ is the source of all grace, and without His assistance in the Holy Ghost we can neither begin, continue nor finish the work of our personal salvation. Faith in Him therefore is the one indispensable requisite whereby His grace will reach us and become effectual in us. In His Word and Sacraments, as means of grace, He really comes to us, and by faith, and prayer, as the deepest expression of faith, we are brought into life union with Him through these means. In His Word He makes known to us the Promise of the Gospel, concretely fulfilled—become flesh and blood in Himself. In the Holy Sacrament of Baptism this fulfilled Promise is signed, sealed and thus made over to us in our infancy. In the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist our Lord, as the glorified Christ, feeds us by faith with His own body and blood, whereby our regenerate life is nourished and built up. Hence true faith directs us to Christ as the Head of His mystical body, the Church, of which we are true members by faith in the proper use of the means of grace, and thus in life union with Him. Faith leads us to look away from ourselves to Him, our Saviour and our God; and the Holy Ghost helps us to bring all our burdens and cares to Him who alone can sustain us.

Therefore we pray in the proper spirit, when, forgetting our feelings and remembering our sins, we ask Christ to reveal Himself to us, to manifest our wants, needs and sins to ourselves, to open the Scriptures to our minds and hearts, to enable us to appreciate the Holy Sacraments, and to give us above all things faith in Him who is the way, the truth and the life. It is positively wrong to seek a certain experience which we may think we ought to have. For religious experience is like pleasure, not an end in itself, not something to be sought for its

own sake. We must come upon it incidentally whilst we truly follow Christ in faith; whilst we seek and follow the path of Christian duty. It cannot be right to earnestly desire and pray for a particular feeling. Does feeling good bring us nearer to Christ? Does it make us better? Does it honor Christ? Is it not rather selfish? Is it not making too much of what is unessential? Is it not seeking a sign instead of taking Christ at His word and trusting Him? Why did the true patriot go to war during our late civil strife? To see the country? To satisfy his roving disposition? To become an experienced soldier? No. He went to fight for his country and his God. Going in this way, from the right motive, he became an experienced soldier, but his experience was to him of altogether secondary importance. So precisely it is with the true followers of Jesus Christ. The question to be asked is not, "Do I feel right?" but always this: "Am I turning away from sin and Satan to God in Christ? Am I giving up all and following my Master in heart and soul?"

Whoever thus draws near to Christ with a true heart in earnest faith learns to know Him. For as the eye, illumined by the light of the sun is the organ through which the mind comes to a knowledge of the sun itself and of all other objects in the natural world, so is faith, illumined by the Sun of Righteousness, the organ through which the soul apprehends Christ Jesus in the Holy Ghost, and comes to a knowledge of its own sin and misery. The sense of sin is indeed universal. Even the heathen, as well as the poor blear-eyed natural man the world over, feels his sin and guilt, but to come to a proper knowledge of his sin and misery, Christ must shine into his soul through his faith, which as a natural capacity the Saviour Himself quickens into living faith through the Holy Ghost. The Lord Jesus is Himself the Gospel, the Sum and Substance of the Glad Tidings of Salvation. His love coming into and warming our hearts begets love for Him. Himself the Image in which man is created, His love, so unselfish, so true, so generous, touches a responsive chord in the susceptible human heart and calls forth its confidence and love. Here lies the root of all true sorrow

and penitence, as well as of all true joy and peace. The boy, who is sure of his mother's love, which love calls out his own love and confidence, is troubled when he disobeys her, and finds comfort, peace, and strength to do better in the future, in her forgiveness and the renewed manifestations of her love. He, who is sure of Christ's love, is penitent and sorrowful because of his sins, and rejoices in Christ forgiving and strengthening him. The experience of true conversion, therefore, consists both in "heartfelt sorrow for sin, causing us to hate and turn from it always more and more," and also in "heartfelt joy in God; causing us to take delight in living according to the will of God in all good works." This experience is not to be attained suddenly, and once for all, but manifests itself gradually and not because we seek it, but because we seek and follow Christ by faith in the use of the means of grace. But it does not move steadily forward, growing as regularly as the healthy child grows in stature. Our souls are sick with sin, and conversion has to do principally with the ethical part of our being. Did we never yield to sin our sorrow for sin and our joy in God would indeed unfold steadily and continuously. But our weakness and depravity, wrought upon by the temptations of the world, the flesh and the Devil, frequently lead us into sin, and oftentimes make us lukewarm, indifferent, cold. We do not always watch and pray as we ought. Hence every believer, unless he gradually loses his interest in Christ and draws back to perdition, passes through spiritual struggles, or crises, more or less decided. Each relapse calls for the renewal of penitence and faith, and for fresh consecration to Christ. And coming to Jesus in sincerity the believer receives new comfort, joy and strength from His Lord. He takes courage and learns to delight more and more in the service of his blessed Master. For as the stone, cast into the heaving lake, starts a series of concentric circles on the surface of the water, that ever widening, move onward till taking in the whole lake, they strike the surrounding shore and are at rest, so the grace of God once lodged in the troubled soul must move onward and still onward, crisis following crisis, until it has, as a living power, reached the outermost periphery of the believer's being, which process is fully

consummated only when he himself lands on the golden shores of the New Jerusalem and is at rest. In this life, clinging to the cross of Christ and living in His light, he learns to rejoice and triumph more and more in his Saviour. He realizes continually more fully that the judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether. More to be desired are they than gold, yea, than much fine gold: sweeter also than honey and the honeycomb. With David and Christ Himself, he says, "I have set the Lord always before me: because He is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt show me the path of life; in Thy presence is fulness of joy; at Thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore." And every man that hath this hope in him purifieth himself even as he is pure. Giving all diligence, such a one adds to his faith virtue; and to virtue knowledge; and to knowledge temperance; and to temperance patience; and to patience godliness; and to godliness, brotherly kindness; and to brotherly kindness, charity. For if these things be in him and abound, they will make him that he shall neither be barren nor unfruitful in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ. Entering ever more fully into the mystery of godliness he learns to appreciate even the sublime utterance of St. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians where he says: "For this cause I bow my knees unto the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, of whom the whole family in heaven and earth is named, that He would grant you, according to the riches of His glory, to be strengthened with might by His Spirit in the inner man; that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith; that ye, being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth and height; and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge, that ye might be filled with all the fullness of God. Now unto Him that is able to do exceeding abundantly above all that we ask or think, according to the power that worketh in us, unto Him be glory *in the Church* by Christ Jesus throughout all ages, world without end. Amen."

## ART. VI.—THE IDEA OF GOD IN ITS BEARING ON HUMAN KNOWLEDGE.

THERE are three general departments under which all knowledge may be comprehended, the knowledge of God, of man, and of the world. Corresponding to these three forms of knowledge are the three necessary ideas of the reason, standing in the three-fold consciousness of man, self-consciousness, world-consciousness, and God-consciousness. This trinity of the human consciousness stands in a necessary unity. There can be no development of self-consciousness without the development at the same time of a consciousness of the world. The *ego* must distinguish itself from the *non-ego*. And there can be no proper unfolding of these two forms of consciousness without a consciousness of God, of the Absolute, which binds the two together. What we call self-consciousness proper differs from the other two forms named, in that in it the subject and object are one and the same. All human knowledge or thought must start in this three-fold consciousness. We would start, therefore, in our examination of the ground of human knowledge, not as Des Cartes, with his proposition, *Cogito, ergo sum*, and then derive the knowledge of the existence of God and the world from this, but with the axioms, I exist, the world exists, God is. No one of these can be demonstrated, because they constitute the first principles on which all reasoning must rest.

Accordingly we find that ancient philosophy, particularly the Greek philosophy, moved forward in its development through three periods, characterized by the object of chief inquiry in each. First came speculation and study in regard to the origin and nature of the world (Cosmogony), then followed the study of man (Ethics and Logic), and this was followed by an age of inquiry into the nature of God (theology,



or theosophy, as in Neo-Platonism). See Ueberweg's *Hist. Phil.* vol. i. p. 26.

It is our purpose in this article to consider the Idea of God, in its bearing on human knowledge.

We know that God is intimately related to man and the world, as the Maker and Preserver of all things, that He is immanent as well as transcendent, that His presence underlies the deepest substance of our life, that conscience testifies of the absolute authority of His law, and that He is the object of worship. So much natural religion teaches. We know also that the presence and grace of God are brought into the world in a still deeper sense in the revelation He has made in His Son Jesus Christ, through whom and in whom the kingdom of God is come on earth. God is the central presence and principle of all religion, for religion is a binding of man to God as the source of his being and the end of his seeking. There is a universal sense of this, and no amount of skeptical philosophy can rule it out of the world. The consciousness of God is in all men, the idea of God is intuitive and innate, at least in possibility. This truth, of course, is vital in considering the general subject of religion, and religion must exert an influence on all departments of human life, on all forms of knowledge. This is not, however, what we propose to consider. We wish to inquire what bearing the idea of God has on human knowledge directly, what the idea of the absolute (which is a form of the idea of God) has to do in all philosophy and science.

We can perhaps consider our subject to the best advantage by noticing and criticising two opposite views that have been advanced in modern times. In answer to the question, can man know the absolute? opposite answers have been given. It is maintained on the one side that man cannot know God, because He is absolute and infinite, and all human knowledge has to do only with the relative and finite,—that while He may be an object of faith, and authenticate Himself in some way to the moral nature, to conscience, as Kant allowed, yet He is entirely excluded from the reach of human thought or

knowledge. The most ultra form of this modern skepticism and infidelity is brought out in what is called the Positive Philosophy, of which Comte is a leading exponent. This shuts out all idea of God from science, yea from the world, for it regards all religion as a stage of superstition merely, through which man passes, a dream of the world's childhood, from which he then enters the metaphysical period, and ends in the positive stage, in which man accepts only a knowledge of mere phenomena as reached by observation and experiment, a dreary, dark, blank infidelity.

This position is taken still more boldly by many leading scientists of the present age, and it is fortified by the assertion that while it may be right enough for philosophy to speculate in regard to an ultimate cause, science in the strict sense has to do only with laws that are open to observation and experience,—that whether there be a God or not, or whether He acts upon the world in an extraordinary way, as above the laws of nature, science at least has nothing to do with such questions. Some go still further and assert that science must rule out all reference to any supra-mundane power. It is just here that much of the science of the present day places itself in antagonism with all revealed religion, and advocates a naturalism which would banish God entirely from His universe.

On the other hand it has been maintained that man can know the absolute, that he can grasp the infinite, and that only by starting from this stand-point can any universal system of knowledge or philosophy be developed, any satisfactory system of science be elaborated. With this problem struggled the great Spinoza, who was said to be drunk with the idea of God, and from this starting-point did such giant thinkers as Schelling and Hegel seek to construct the system of the universe in their philosophy of the absolute. On the one side thought gives up the problem, flees from it, and, in the case of some, seeks to shut out entirely all thought of God; on the other side the thinker grapples with it and imagines that he is able to master it, as Hegel, when he attempted to explain the very genesis of the being of God by a dialectic process from non-being.

There is a sense in which all such efforts to scale the heavens by the power of human thought is profane. "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty to perfection?" "No man hath seen God at any time; the only-begotten Son, who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath revealed Him." The boldness and pride of thought may become a snare quite as dangerous as doubt and infidelity.

What answer, then, must we give to the question, Can man know the absolute? We answer, he can, in the sense that he has the idea of the absolute as an intuition of the reason, just as he has a sense of moral obligation to God in conscience. To deny this would be to say that there are no soundings or echoes of the eternal in man's intellectual nature, and sunder his intellectual from his moral nature. Then the words eternal, absolute, infinite, would be for him words without meaning, and no explanation could be given as to how they ever found their way into the human vocabulary. It does not relieve the difficulty to say, that the infinite is merely the non-finite, and that therefore while we may have a positive conception of the finite, what lies beyond is unknowable. The great matter here is that there *is a beyond*, an unlimited, boundless sphere of being. To know that such a sphere of being *is*, is everything for the point here concerned, for without this we could form no conception of the finite. To be able to assert such a negation as the non-finite implies a positive idea, we say not conception, of the infinite. The two are related as necessarily as the law of identity and the law of contradiction in logic.  $A=A$  requires that we should be able to assert that  $A$  does not equal non- $A$ . The idea of the infinite is postulated in thinking the finite. Kant was right when he said, in presenting his *autonomies*, that man cannot think the finite without at the same time thinking the infinite, nor can he think the infinite without at the same time thinking the finite. Let any one attempt, for instance, to think of the universe as limited, and, on the supposition that it is limited, ask himself what lies beyond its limits, and he will at once see the force of what we have said. To deny the idea of infinity is at the same time to destroy the concep-

tion of the finite. We know that the universe is not infinite in the sense that God is infinite, and yet it reflects the infinity of God in such a way that we cannot contemplate it without being apprehended at once by the idea of the infinite.

But in addition to the criticism thus based on the words used to designate the absolute, we may press the argument that, to allow that God can authenticate Himself to man's moral nature, and then deny all power of apprehending Him in any sense by the intellectual nature, the reason, would be to create a dualism in man's being. His very personality implies that the absolute sounds through him, and if no echoes are heard in reason, then there would be a gulf between reason and conscience. They would be unintelligible to each other; and this would involve then also a dualism between faith and knowledge, and revelation and science.

But when we say that man has an idea of the absolute, we must not infer that man can comprehend the absolute in the way of understanding it. It pertains to the nature of the *idea* that it is not limited and bound, but is universal in its character. What holds in the reason as idea, when reduced to the forms of the understanding, becomes in the very nature of the case limited. The reason is the eye of the intellectual nature of man that can at least look out into infinity, though it can not in any sense measure it, while the understanding has to do with the finite. And this is so, no doubt, because the finite and infinite are themselves so related as that the one is in the other. The one does not exclude the other. The infinite comprehends the finite, underlies it, and is its substantial support. The reason has a sense of this. This is a very different thing from saying that reason can comprehend the infinite. It can apprehend it. We can agree with Kant, and Sir William Hamilton after him, in saying that we can form no *conception* of God, and any attempt of the natural reason to find Him out in this sense must be regarded not only as vain but profane. In this respect Kant did good service in clipping the wings of boasting rationalism, and taught reason to be humble; and in establishing the reality of a *priori*

knowledge he demolished the skepticism of such men as Hume; but in shutting out God entirely from cognition he in turn played into the hands of rationalists. It has always been felt that there is an inconsistency here in his view on this point taken in his Critique of pure reason and that in his Critique of the practical reason. In the latter, the idea of God becomes a necessity, while in the former it is ruled out. Yet there must be a God for the reason as well as for the will, for the intellectual as well as for the moral nature of man. "I am that I am" must become in some sense an intelligible word for the reason as well as the "thou shalt" must be a categorical imperative for the will.

What we have now said of our subject will appear still more clearly if we consider it more practically in the way of example and illustration.

In philosophy we think of the absolute in the forms of the good, the beautiful, the true. The good is for the will, the beautiful for the phantasy, the true for the intellect.

Take for instance the science of Ethics. What is left here without the idea of the absolute good? How can we come to any proper apprehension of will and free obedience on the part of man without positing an absolute will that is to be obeyed? How can we understand the nature of laws or rights without the idea of universal law and absolute right? It is only when an absolute is posited for ethical science that we can escape the utilitarian and eudæmonistic principles that have perverted and degraded so many systems of morality. Not only must the absolute authenticate itself to the will as a categorical imperative, but we must apprehend it intellectually in order to any true metaphysics of Ethics. Take away this grand background or reservoir from the study of Ethics, and you have only an empty shell, a stream without a fountain that loses itself in the sand.

In like manner the science of *Æsthetics* requires the idea of the beautiful. The beautiful is the infinite as apprehended by the phantasy in finite forms. The animal can have no sense of the beautiful or the sublime, just because it has no sense of the infinite or absolute as the mystery that underlies the creation. A

sense of the beautiful, I know, is not the same thing with the thought or intellectual apprehension of it; but the one requires the other, else there would be no metaphysics of *Æsthetics*, no bond of connection between the phantasy and the reason. If the phantasy has to do with the infinite (not indeed directly but mediately through the finite), the reason must be able to apprehend the idea.

The same must hold in regard to the true, which brings us more directly into the sphere and scope of science. Science proper has for its mission to bring the intellect into communication with the true, with truth in its variegated forms. There is also a metaphysics of the true, what is generally understood by *Metaphysics* in which we seek all the axioms and postulates of science. For, truth is one, and all the particular sciences must refer themselves to the idea of truth in general. We find here that we cannot move a single step with any light until we have the idea of absolute truth.

This point needs to be carefully noted. There is an impression with some that ontology belongs only to the sphere of pure metaphysics, that questions in regard to the essence of things, to their ultimate origin and final end, belong entirely to philosophy, and have nothing to do with science. Many eminent scientists of the present day in this way seek to sunder science from philosophy. Comte turns over metaphysics, as he does religion, to a by-gone stadium of historical development. And the popular mind sympathizes with this disregard of philosophy. It exercises itself in beating the air. It is a sort of intellectual gymnastics. It has done nothing in the discovery of truth, &c. Such are the charges made against it, and because comparatively few are qualified for abstract thinking, the metaphysician finds very little sympathy with the multitude.

And yet with all this, philosophy always rules the thinking of the age. As people reason on the basis of axioms, and reason, too, without knowing the meaning of a syllogism, so the principles of philosophy continually mould the thinking of the people. And science, also, must accept its necessary dependence on philosophy. It has a certain measure of inde-

pendence. It has doubtless been greatly wronged in past ages by being held in unnatural bondage to philosophy and religion. It is now asserting its independence, and in doing so its danger is in attempting to free itself from all restraint.

But it is plain that no science can thus snnder itself from philosophic thought; for it belongs to the very conception of science, that it must have to do with general principles and not merely with facts. Science is systematic knowledge, but in reducing facts to a system we come at once into the region of principles which the mere facts, as phenomena, cannot supply. It matters not whether we proceed by induction or deduction, the result must be the same. Scientists are continually talking about laws, but what are laws but generalizations, and in order to pass from any given number of facts to a general law, we must pass from the phenomenal to the supersensuous. Men who deny philosophy are constantly using philosophy to set it aside. Darwin, for instance, finds a different origin for man than the Scripture doctrine of creation teaches, but he must call in speculation to reach his conclusion, for neither he nor any one else ever saw an animal transformed into a human being.

But, now, if philosophical principles must underlie, and permeate all science, then it follows that the ideas of the reason must also perform an office in all science. And if the idea of the infinite is intuitive in the reason, it cannot be excluded from science. Accordingly we find that every science has its mystery, its hidden depths. It has its beginnings in mystery and its ends in mystery. It is like a picture in which a portion of the landscape is separated from its natural finite surroundings, just to impress us with a sense of the infinite; that looks through it. Mathematics has its paradox in its infinite series, astronomy its boundless universe. Language points to thought, and all thinking implies infinite reason. Natural science, history, mental science, all lead into depths that require to be interpreted in the light of the idea of the infinite. To rule out, not only the idea of God, as He is known to us in revelation, but the idea of the absolute from science is to put out its own



light. Comte says, the beginning and the end of things is unknowable to us. Only what lies between these two, belongs to us. He will accept neither atheism nor theism, neither transcendent nor immanent causes. But what is this but the ostrich hiding its head in the sand? Here is the root of the skepticism of science. It can all be traced to an ignoring of any idea of the absolute in man, and this is like putting out the eye because it cannot see to the utmost limits of the universe.

We do not complain of this skepticism in science because it does not accept the direct guidance of the Bible, or revelation. The Bible was not given as a guide directly for science. The two move in different spheres and have different objects in view. The Church was wrong when it attempted to control science directly, and theologians in this age are wrong, we think, when they set up the Bible as against the deductions or conclusions of science. But we charge upon this skepticism first that it wrongs itself, and contradicts reason, when it rules out the idea of God, in the form in which this idea holds in the reason, from science. Just here is the point where it must be met on its own ground. When science denies the law of cause and effect, and declares that reason can recognize sequence only, and that the idea of a first cause, that is itself uncaused, is an unknowable term to science, we charge it with wilfully closing its own eyes to the light, and then declaring that light does not exist.

This skepticism, we know, says, it is not our province to assert anything in regard to God, or transcendent causes or principles. If a God there be, and if there be transcendent causes or powers, the religionist, not we, have to do with that question. But it will be noticed that while they do not consider it their province to teach for God, they inevitably regard it as their mission to teach against God. They "deny God, deny mind, deny even self." Of course we do not charge this on science itself, but on a certain class of scientific men, the materialists, who have not been few in these latter times.

Religion cannot help science here directly. It would be

at best only an external authority in this form for reason, and obedience to it would have no ethical significance. It will not cure the evil of Darwinism to confront it with the account of man's creation in Genesis, and say, give up your infidel theory and take that. It must be met first on its own ground, and shown to be unphilosophical and unscientific. At least it must be shown that the Scripture account is not inconsistent with the established facts of science.

But what is to be done if the scientific man denies that man has any idea of the absolute, or of God? We would seek to show him that by proceeding with such denial, he becomes involved in contradiction and confusion, that he becomes inconsistent. It may be possible that he will persist in his denial, and this only shows that man may shut out the revelation which God makes, though dimly, in nature and reason, and that those especially who refuse His higher revelation in Christ are in danger of having the light that is in them turned to darkness. When Christ confronted the Jews with the revelation and presence of God in His own person, and they refused to believe on Him, He charged home upon them that they had destroyed and obliterated the revelation they already had. "If ye were of God, ye would hear God's words;" that is, if ye were true to the revelation of the God of the Old Testament, ye would recognize the God of the New. So the skepticism of science blots out the idea of God as He reveals Himself in man, and in the universe, and then it denies His higher revelation in His Son, Jesus Christ.

It is just in this idea of the absolute, that we find a connecting link between science and religion. It is related to science in the one direction through philosophy, as we have seen. And we may see from this, how necessary it is that science should not be divorced from philosophy, and how necessary it is that philosophy itself should understand and be true to its great mission. It sits queen over the realm of all science. It sheds its light down through the winding, dusky avenues that lead up to the temple of truth. Without it all knowledge becomes disorganized and loses itself in confusion. Hence it is, that

no course of liberal education can be complete that does not end in philosophy, and that is not based upon philosophy throughout. Without this there may be acquisition of knowledge in various directions, but the education will lack unity. It is no reason that philosophy should be eschewed or neglected in our higher institutions, because it has at times spent its energies in useless vagaries or scholastic subtleties. Like every other good thing it may be misused. But it still remains true, that without philosophy scientific knowledge, or education, must lack unity. Even where it is formally neglected, some philosophy will nevertheless exert a controlling influence over the thought of an institution. It may be that the system of Bacon and Locke, tending to sensationalism, has become ingrained in all the teaching, even where they are not formally recognized as authorities, or it may be that Herbert Spencer has gained the ascendancy, and with him the skepticism of science to which we have referred. It is a matter of vital importance, that the thinking in our higher institutions should be organized by a sound philosophy.

Having now considered the bearing of the idea of God on human knowledge in philosophy and science, we proceed to consider its relation to the revelation of God in Christ, or in revealed religion. We have not intended in this article, to present this idea, or philosophy as enshrining this idea, as a sufficient guide in human knowledge. We believe just the contrary. Philosophy in itself is not a safe guide for science. It must stand related to a higher guide, and thus become the mediating link between Christianity and science. In the treatment of this point we may be able to find the true relation between revelation and science, a problem that is of the utmost importance in this age.

We may say in the first place, that the revelation in Christ does not supersede the idea of God, or the idea of the absolute, lodged in the reason, but it confirms and illumines it. The world of nature still remains as the creation of God, even though a new creation has come in Christ.

Nature, with her systems and laws is still the object of human study, and investigation. The laws of language and thought, remain unchanged, and science still moves forward in its investigations and discoveries. The same God who framed the worlds and made man a reasonable being, reveals Himself for man's salvation in Christ. When Christ came as the bread from heaven to support man's true life, He did not take away the material which supports his bodily life. When He brought into the world the light of heavenly wisdom, He did not thereby supersede the necessity of man's gaining knowledge in the ordinary way. Christianity does not take the place of science.

So the consciousness of God, the God-idea, remains in man, and continues to be the condition in man by which a revelation is possible. The absolute reason which the human reason apprehends, is just the light which proceeds forth from the eternal Word. In Him was life, and the life was the light of men. This was the true light that, coming into the world, lighteneth every man. The idea of the absolute continues all the same to assert itself in all human knowledge. The laws of thinking and reasoning are the same now that they were in the time of Aristotle. As man must still reach the discipline of his intellectual powers through their exercise in study, as he must study the sciences in order to become learned, so philosophy must still classify and unify all man's knowledge, and still occupy its throne among the sciences.

In the second place the revelation in Christ illumines with a flood of light the whole realm of nature, the whole sphere of knowledge, especially in relation to their proper end. Thus when He was on the earth, He revealed the significance of nature by the light thrown upon it in the parable, where He brought out the deep inner correspondence between nature and the supernatural. As Christian students and scholars, we do not set aside the truth that Plato found in the realm of ideas as a world of reality above the phenomenal, but we know now that those ideas are forms of the absolute, confronting the reason and informing the reason, while the absolute Absolute,

as it has been called, is the true and living God revealed to us in Christ our Lord. Here comes to us the light that removes the darkness from the human mind, and enables us to interpret all truth with reference to its end. The ideas of Plato, which were as dark, shadowy images to him, now stand out in the clear light. As mountain top and valley, river and plain, come out to view, in the light of the rising sun, so the light of truth reveals to us what is only shadowy and dim in the light of nature and reason.

In the third place, Christianity not only reveals more clearly the fragmentary truth we possess in nature and reason, but enables it to come to its proper unity and perfection. It comes to us as the proper complement and fulfillment of all knowledge and all truth. As the knowledge of the Alphabet finds its meaning in the formation of words and sentences, and without going on to this would remain without any proper end, so all knowledge, all science, comes to its completion in the knowledge of God in Christ. Here the idea of God becomes filled out with its proper contents.

It does not follow from this, that philosophy must give up its work and mission in its own sphere, and merge itself into Christian theology, nor that it must receive the guidance of revelation in the way of an external authority. But neither are we to regard the two as moving in separate and independent spheres, which can never touch each other nor come into any real communion. This view we know is often taken by Christian teachers. They say, science receives its facts on the evidence of the senses, while religion receives its facts on a different kind of evidence, addressed to faith. But faith and reason cannot be sundered. Religion has to do with knowledge also, and its knowledge must be the highest reason. There must be in man a connecting link, or at least a basis for reconciling the knowledge derived from nature and reason, and that derived from revelation. While the two move in their own spheres, they must not remain apart and contradictory, but find an affinity and a harmony.

Christian theology, for instance, freely uses the knowledge

of science, and especially of philosophy, in producing its system of thought. Christianity domiciliated itself, as we know, in forms of thought and government, which Greece and Rome furnished it, while it still remained a new life, a new creation. It retained its independence still. So, we maintain, science and philosophy can proceed on their own stand-point, and yet employ the light that comes to them from revelation, not indeed as an external, mechanical guide, but as entering and guiding them from within. And the point around which they can thus harmonize above all others is, we think, the God-idea in man.

That there should be difficulty in harmonizing the two at all points we need not wonder, because the two orders, the natural and the supernatural, are not yet united in fact in the work of redemption, but the two are in essential harmony—must be—because both are the work of one God and Father. But we do not propose to extend our remarks on this point. What we have aimed at is to bring out the bearing, which the idea of God has on human knowledge, and the sphere in which this idea must exert its chief moulding influence is Philosophy, and through this also in science. When this is once admitted, there will be a recognized common ground, so to speak, for science and revelation. The revelation of God in Christ, will prove itself the true light to aid in developing natural truth—natural religion will at least point to a revelation, and revelation will authenticate itself as that in which alone the natural can realize its true end.

## ART. VII.—THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.

BY PROF. F. A. GAST.

AMONG the nations of antiquity, there is one that is surrounded with a higher glory and a more sacred interest, than all others. It is the people of Israel. Other nations have played a more prominent part in the external fortunes of man ; none has exerted a deeper, more lasting and more beneficial influence on his spiritual life.

Yet Israel was in many respects an insignificant people. Its territory was small. It never carried its arms far beyond the narrow boundaries of Palestine. It felt no ambition, like Rome, to found a universal empire. Military success was not its grand aim. Even in the peaceful pursuits of commerce and navigation, it was far outrivaled by the neighboring Phenicians. Philosophy, science and art never engaged its highest energies, as they engaged the energies of Egypt and Greece. Its noblest achievements belong to another and higher sphere ; and that sphere is religion. The religion of Israel constitutes its true, almost its only glory.

With religion the general interests of the nation and the private interests of the individual were intimately and indissolubly connected. Its law related to a large extent to public worship. Daily occupations were hallowed by divinely prescribed and significant ceremonies. Festivals were frequent, and the blood of sacrifice flowed in an almost constant stream. The nation had its wars ; but they were in defence of its altars, as much as of its hearths. It had its literature ; but that literature was so entirely the fruit of its pure, sober, unmythological religion, that epic poetry found no place in it and the drama never advanced beyond its rudimentary beginnings. Philosophy, in the sense of a system reasoned out according to the laws of logic,



it never had ; yet its sacred books embody philosophic principles profounder and more comprehensive than ever were reached by the sages of India or Greece,—for, viewing all things in the higher light of religion, the inspired writers trace them back to their deepest and most fundamental relation—their relation to God.

Israel was the nation of religion, as classic Greece was of science and art, and classic Rome, of government and legislation. This was its sole importance. "The history of this ancient people" says Ewald, "is in reality the history of the growth of true religion rising through all stages to perfection, pressing on through all conflicts to the highest victory, and finally revealing itself in full glory and power, in order to spread irresistibly from this centre, never again to be lost, but to become the eternal possession and blessing of all nations."\*

What was that religion of which Israel was the bearer and of which the Old Testament is the record? Especially, what was its relation to heathenism, on the one side, and to Christianity, the religion of the New Testament, on the other? A few brief hints in answer to these questions is all that our time will allow.

In saying that Israel was the nation of religion, we do not imply that other nations were destitute of religion, but only that their special mission lay in another sphere. No people has yet been found without some consciousness of God, however vague and imperfect, and without some feeling of guilt, however dim. Even among the most degraded races, oracles have been consulted to ascertain the divine will, prayer offered and penances undergone to secure the divine favor, and bloody sacrifices laid upon altars to appease the divine wrath. Religion in one form or another is as universal as man ; for it is the deepest necessity of his spiritual nature.

Seeing, then, that Israel was not in the exclusive possession of religion, wherein is the religion of the Old Testament distinguished from the Gentilic religions? In this, that it is the off-

---

\* Ewald's *History of Israel*, English translation, Vol. 1, p. 5

spring of revelation, while all heathen religions, from the fetichism of the African tribes to the beautiful religion of Greece, are the products of nature, the spontaneous outgrowth of the human mind, struggling by its unaided light and power to enter into union and communion with God. And while the Gentile nations were not wholly withdrawn from the general guidance of God, nor unilluminated by single rays of truth, they were yet suffered "to walk in their own ways." Their religions, to use the beautiful expression of Schelling, were "religions that grew wild" in the soil of man's unregenerate life. Heathenism had its origin on earth, and exhibits the poverty and helplessness of man; the religion of Israel sprang from heaven and reveals the riches of the grace of God. In the one, man gropes in the dark, blindly feeling after God, if haply he may find Him; in the other, God seeks man and, entering into personal fellowship with him, communicates a light and a life which the highest culture in science and art, in literature and government could not give. The one is the manifestation of the human need of salvation, a yearning cry from earth to heaven for help; the other is the manifestation of the Divine will of salvation, the gracious response from heaven to earth. In a word, the religion of Israel, unlike the religions of other nations, is a religion of revelation, in which God, by act and word, by miracle and prophecy, comes ever nearer to man, that in Christ He may finally become man and thus bring the fulness of His life and grace into the bosom of our fallen world.

Attempts have not indeed been wanting to explain the religion of the Old Testament, as the natural and necessary result of the historical development of humanity, which, rising out of its originally rude and barbarous condition, is supposed gradually to mount to the summit of perfection, as well in the religious, as in the intellectual and social life.

According to the Hegelian philosophy, the religious development of man comprises three stages, each of which gives birth to particular religions that exhibit, in single and peculiar aspects, the relation of the Infinite to the finite, of the Absolute to nature. The lowest stage is the religion of nature and of

magic ; the highest, the absolute religion, Christianity ; and the intermediate, transition stage is the religion of spiritual individuality under three special forms : the religion of Israel, the religion of Greece, and the religion of Rome. The religion of Israel Hegel designates the religion of Sublimity, because in his view it regards God as dualistically sundered from the world, hovering over it, but never entering into true union with its life. On this account he places it on a lower plane than the Greek religion of Beauty and the Roman religion of Law, in both of which there is effected, in a partial and inadequate ways that reconciliation of the Infinite and the finite which is fully brought to pass in Christianity, the religion of Incarnation.

But this once popular philosophy of religion belongs to an age that has passed away,—an age of *a priori* speculation that paid almost no regard to historical facts. It fails to comprehend the fundamental truth of Israel's religion. By assigning to it a lower place than to the pagan religions of Greece and Rome, it betrays extreme ignorance of its ethical significance. Indeed what it describes as the religion of Sublimity is rather the religion of the Koran than that of the Old Testament.

As this view affords no satisfactory explanation of the origin and growth of Jehovism in its doctrinal and moral contrast to all, even the highest, forms of heathenism, it has been superseded by another, which seeks the solution in a peculiar native genius for religion,—a genius that distinguished Israel from all other nations. Israel, it is said, by a natural instinct, cherished a loftier aspiration than they. Its aim was nothing less than the true, perfect religion,—“a good which all aspiring nations of antiquity made a commencement and an attempt to attain ; which some, the Indians and Persians, for example, really abored to achieve with admirable devotion of noble energies ; but which this people alone clearly discerned from the beginning, and then pursued for centuries through all difficulties, and with the utmost firmness and consistency, until they attained it, so far as, among men and in ancient times, attainment was possible.”\* From the dawn of its history it set out gladly in quest

---

\* Ewald's History, Vol. I. p. 4.

of this spiritual boon. It bent its highest and noblest energies to reach the goal. Periods of decline and apostasy there doubtless were, as well for the nation as for individuals: but the deepest and truest life of the people always aroused itself anew for the pursuit, until after ages of weary seeking, Israel, and Israel alone of all the nations of the earth, was fortunate enough to find the prize.

There can be no question that this view contains many and profound elements of truth. It may be said especially of Ewald, its ablest and most learned representative, that he has a clear eye to discern the sublime idea, and a warm heart to feel the moral majesty of that religion which the Old Testament embodies. Undeniably, there exists a natural predisposition for this religion in the peculiarity of the Semitic mind,—its energetic concentration of thought and feeling, its inwardness and easily excited susceptibility, its rapid and high tension of the imagination. There was Divine wisdom in the choice of Israel rather than of an Aryan nation with its predominant objectivity of spirit, to be the bearer of Old Testament religion. The monothestic instinct which Renan conceives to be an original endowment of the Semitic mind may have no existence; but there does exist in that mind an original aptitude to receive and develop under the guidance of revelation the monothestic spiritual religion of Israel.

That, however, is one thing; and to regard this religion as the natural, spontaneous product of the mind of this ancient Semitic people, is quite another. It can never be explained as the fruit of the national life. The paths which Israel instinctively chose were not the paths marked out for it by Jehovah. Its history shows that the proclivity to error and the danger of falling into the bondage of nature, were as strong in it as in the surrounding nations. Israel in the end submitted in mind and heart to the religion which came to it as a gift; but it submitted only after ages of stubborn resistance. There were needed all the rigid discipline of its Law, and all the severe chastisements and bitter experiences of its long history, and all the stern rebukes and denunciations of its noble prophets, before

its religion came to be established in the life of the people as upon immovable foundations. Israel's religion was not a necessary fact of its nature, but a free implantation into its history.

In this light it was viewed by the nation itself. It was no arrogant, but idle boast, when this people named itself "the people of God," singled out from among the nations of the earth to be the theatre of a supernatural history and the repository of divine truth. It was the simple expression of a sublime fact, when Israel claimed that Jehovah was its King and that He had entered into special covenant with it as with no other people. It was not a vain delusion nor yet a rhetorical flourish, when Israel's prophets introduced their announcements of the will of heaven with a "Thus saith the Lord." For nothing can be more certain than that the religion of the Old Testament is not the product of human wisdom, but the free gift of divine revelation.

In no other way can we give a satisfactory explanation of its origin and character. How else shall we account for the wide contrast which it presents to all the religions of the heathen world? Israel, and Israel alone, among the nations of old, knew the Living Personal God. Its religion was a spiritual monotheism. While the universal mind of Paganism was fettered by the power of nature and incapable of discerning a God distinct from, and transcending all cosmical life, this chosen people, without philosophic culture and at the earliest dawn of its history, had attained somehow to the thought of the "One God" clothed with the highest attributes of personal spirit, the Creator of all things, the Judge of all men and the Fountain of all good. It was a thought to whose sublime height even a Socrates and a Plato could not soar. Their conception of deity was doubtless purer and more spiritual than that of the uncultivated masses; but the conception of a *holy* God, a God of *love*, lay far beyond the range of their philosophic vision. Yet this conception dwelt in the mind of Israel from the very beginning. Nor was it the exclusive possession of a few sages; rather it was a national inheritance transmitted from the earliest of their

forefathers, and as familiar to the peasant as to the prophet and the priest. God, the one, holy, personal God,—that is the grand thought which distinguishes this nation from all others and which it made the centre and aim of its life.

And as Israel alone knew the True God, so it alone felt a real and deep sense of sin. Its religion was *ethical*, as well as monotheistic. "Be ye holy, for I am holy" was the solemn injunction laid upon this people, an injunction that touched the deepest springs of its life. "The law," says Luthardt, "was a constant remembrancer and a constant convictor of sin. Sacrifice was the central point of all the rites and ceremonies of the law. The sacred fire was to be burning incessantly upon the altar; sacrifices were to be offered day by day; and the climax of all sacrifice was that offered on the great day of atonement, on which the high-priest, as the representative of the nation, laid upon the sacrificial animal the sins of the whole people, and bore the blood of atonement into the place of God's typical presence, and sprinkled with it the mercy-seat, that the people might be absolved from sin and reconciled to God. A more striking remembrance of sin does not exist; nor is there a nation in whom the consciousness of sin was deeper, more genuine or more powerful than in this."\*

Israel, it has been well said, is the conscience of the world. Read the Psalms, and mark the moral tone by which they are pervaded! What a profound feeling of guilt, what a heartfelt penitence for sin, what an earnest spirit of prayer, what a living communion with God they express in the simplest and most childlike utterances! They are the holy inspirations of the Holy One of Israel. The religion that could give birth to them must be infinitely exalted in its spirit above the highest religions of the pagan world. For what are the most elevated hymns and the most devout prayers that Greece and Rome have produced, but the wild outpourings of hearts distracted by a fantastic and corrupting mythology? While heathenism is unconscious of sin, because it knows not a Holy God, Israel on

---

\* Luthardt's *Fundamental Truths*, p. 250.

the other hand, walking in the revealed law of Jehovah, is filled with the deepest sense of unworthiness and guilt.

Yet there was no gloom or despair. Rather, the people of the Old Testament was pre-eminently the people of *hope*, and its religion, the religion of the future. While other nations looked back and sighed for a Golden Age that had departed forever, Israel constantly looked forward and anticipated the brightest glories in the time to come. Already in the remotest age of its history, there was awakened in it a presentiment of its exalted destiny. Insignificant among the nations as regards the territory it occupied and the political influence it exerted, it yet cherished an unwavering belief that in the seed of Abraham all the families of the earth should be blessed. Its faith in the advent of One who should be a Prophet greater than Moses and a King more glorious than David, was kept alive from age to age by types and promises. Indeed, the entire history of Israel was a continuous prophecy, which grew clearer and more definite the nearer it approached fulfilment. The attitude of this chosen people was that of constant expectation. "While other nations were growing weary of their gods—without anything in their mythology or philosophy to satisfy the deep cravings of their nature—with religion operating rather as a barrier than a link between the educated and the ignorant—with morality divorced from theology—the whole Jewish people were united in a feeling of attachment to their sacred institutions, and found in the facts of their past history a pledge of the fulfilment of their national hopes." \*

And the fulfillment came; for the religion of the Old Testament introduced that of the New. Christianity is the goal toward which the development of revelation in all its stages had hitherto been tending. From the beginning Israel felt a sense of the relative character of its religion. It maintained this sense unimpaired through the best periods of its national life. It lost it only when, in the post-canonical age, Jehovism degenerated into a narrow and exclusive Judaism. The reli-

---

\* Conybeare & Howson's *Life of St. Paul*, p. 30.



gion of the Old Testament is throughout a promise only, a shadow, a type. Its conscious aspiration and purest endeavors are toward something higher and better than itself. Christ is its Alpha and Omega,—the ruling idea of its entire movement. Apart from Christ it has no meaning. Only in the light of Christ can it be rightly understood.

It is needful that we emphasize this truth. He who loses sight of it will wrong the religion of the New Testament no less than that of the Old. The New has its historical foundation in the Old; and the Old reaches its deepest meaning in the New. Between the two there exists *an inward organic unity*.

This indeed has often been denied. In all periods of the Church's history, some have attempted to divorce the New from the Old, and refused to admit any other than an external connection. In the Patristic age, while the Ebionites regarded Christianity as only a higher form of Judaism, which aimed to realize the popular idea of the Messiah, the Gnostics viewed it as standing in irrepressible conflict with the Old Testament. In the eyes of Marcion, the chief representative of this tendency, the religion of the New Testament had worth only as it broke away from the traditional bonds of the Old.\* In the Reformation age, Socinus, while acknowledging a certain historical value in the earlier Scriptures, ascribed to them no higher dogmatic and religious importance than other Protestants ascribed to the Apocrypha.† And in modern times the same disposition has often manifested itself to deny the internal and indissoluble tie between the religion of Israel and the religion of Christ. Schleiermacher, especially, was so deeply impressed with what is new and absolute in the New Testament revelation, that he failed to see the necessity of its historical mediation in the Old. In manifest injustice to the Mosaic religion, which he confounds too much with the later Judaism, he maintains that Christianity stands in no closer internal relation to it than to the pagan religions of Greece and Rome.‡

\* Hagenbach's History of Doctrine, p. 75. † Hagenbach, Vol. ii. p. 240.

‡ Glaubenslehre, § 12.

But it is becoming more and more evident continually through a profounder study of the Bible, that the religion of the Old Testament is not indifferent to that of the New, and that the religion of the New is inwardly bound to that of the Old. They form an organic whole, pervaded by the presence of the same spirit of revelation. The attitude which Christ assumed toward the Old Testament was not one of hostility. He indeed opposed the degenerate Judaism of His age; but it is hardly necessary to say that the Judaism of the scribes is not identical with the Jehovism of the prophets. The one with its dead literalism and false national hopes, takes its rise only when the other begins to fall into decay. So far from placing Himself in antagonism with the true religion of the Old Testament, Jesus stood forth rather as its defender against those who, professing to be its friends, were yet in reality its most destructive foes. He lived in the Old Testament. His spirit was in large measure nourished by communion with its saints. He felt no disharmony between it and Himself. On the contrary, He saw in it a progressive movement of which He was Himself the predestined goal. The pious Israelite, in becoming a disciple of Christ, knew that he was not, as in this case a heathen would be, disloyal to the religion of his fathers. Jesus was no revolutionist; He was not even a reformer: He was a fulfiller, in whom the Old Economy reached its appointed end. And the Israelite, in attaching himself to His person, felt an inward conviction that he was acting in obedience to the spirit of his earlier religion.

But while it is necessary to insist strongly on the internal unity of the two Testaments, it is equally necessary to observe clearly the broad *difference* between them. Here, as elsewhere, unity is one thing, uniformity quite another. The old religion cannot be elevated to the plane of the new; the new is not simply a higher stage of the old. Mosaism may give birth to Prophetism as a higher development of Old Testament religion; but neither Mosaism nor Prophetism can give birth to Christianity. The religion of the New Testament does not spring genetically from that of the Old. It is a new creation

in the person of Christ, the absolute revelation of the eternal Word; and while this revelation is mediated by all the preceding stages of Old Testament history and thus stands in strictest continuity with the earlier revelation to the people of Israel, it is the manifestation of something new and not merely the further unfolding of something old. There is a dividing line between the Old and the New, which must be carefully maintained.

This, it must be confessed, has not always been done. While the early Church happily escaped the dangerous error of opposing the New Testament to the Old, it was not so happy in avoiding the no less dangerous error of confounding the one with the other. This is true especially of the Alexandrine School which saw only a difference of degree between the Law and the Gospel, and ascribed to the prophets in general the same high illumination which it ascribed to the Apostles. But even Augustine, and with him the other Fathers of the Church, failed to distinguish the two Economies rightly from a theoretical point of view.\* Nor were the Reformers more successful. Amid all the difference of external forms, they discerned no difference in doctrine, but regarded the dogmatic faith of the Old Testament as identical with that of the New Testament. And in the orthodoxy of the seventeenth century there was a complete identification, from the after effects of which we are still suffering.

The source of this error is not difficult to trace. It lay in a one-sided intellectualistic conception of revelation, as essentially, almost exclusively a communication of doctrinal truth to the understanding; and since the truth of revelation can only be one, the older divines sought and supposed they found the theoretical teachings of the New Testament, everywhere in the pages of the Old. The one was for them as rich a repository

\* Augustine c. Adim. Ch. iii. 4: "*Certis quibusdam umbris et figuris . . . populus ille tenebatur, qui Testamentum Vetus acceperat: tamen in eo tanta prædicationis et prænuntiatio Novi Testamenti est, ut nulla (in Retract. i. 22, 2: *pæne nulla*) in evangelia atque apostolica disciplina reperiantur, quamvis ardua et divina, præcepta et promissa, qua illis etiam libris veteribus desint.*" Quoted by Oehler: *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, p. 36.

of *dicta probantia*, for the peculiar dogmas of Christianity, and quite as available, as the other. The mystery of the Trinity was as fully disclosed to Moses as to John. The saints of the Old Testament, the patriarchs and prophets, had at least the grand outlines of the Christian salvation before their vision; and though its full meaning was not perfectly clear to their minds, they stood, in an intellectual point of view, at no great disadvantage, behind the Christian believer. In a word, for the theologians of an earlier age, as indeed, for many of this, almost the only distinction between the Old Economy and the New was this: that to believers standing in the former, salvation was something still future in fact, though, as foreshadowed by types and announced by prophecy, present to thought; while on the other hand, in the Christian Economy, salvation has actually been brought to pass, and believers, standing in this economy, possess in reality what the pious in Israel could only long for as an object of prophetic vision.\*

It is evident, however, to one who has a right conception of the historical character of revelation, that this is not the relation which the religion of the Old Testament sustains to that of the New. Such an abstractly supernaturalistic view wrongs the whole idea of revelation. It will not allow the divine to come into true union with the human. It ignores the natural in the vain dream of thus honoring the supernatural. Old Testament history ceases to be truly historical, and is trans-

---

\* In confirmation of these assertions, take the following extracts from the writings of the Reformers, as quoted by Oehler. Luther on Gal. iv. 2: "(Christus) patribus in V. T. in spiritu veniebat, antequam in carne appareret. Habebant illi in spiritu Christum, in quem revelandum, ut nos in jam revelatum, credebant, ac neque per eum salvati sunt ut nos, juxta illud: 'Jesus Christus heri et hodie idem est et in sæcula.'"

Melancthon's *Locci*: "Nam ut sciremus, doctrinam ecclesie solam, primam et veram esse, Deus singulari beneficio scribi perpetuam historiam ab initio voluit . . . et hunc libro . . . addidit testimonia editis ingentibus miraculis, ut sciremus, unde et quomodo ab initio propagata sit ecclesie doctrina."

Calvin's *Institutes*: "In eo elucet Dei constantia, quod eandem omnibus sæculis doctrinam tradidit; quem ab initio præcepit nominis sui cultum, in eo requiringdo perseverat. Quod externam formam et modum mutavit in eo non se ostendit mutationi obnoxium: sed hominum capitui, qui varius ac mutabilis est catenus se attemperavit."

formed into a divine play. Patriarchs and prophets become mere automata in the hand of God, and with no independent life, they think, speak and act only as they are magically touched by a foreign power. Inspired men are regarded as the passive organs of the Holy Ghost; and from this point of view it is not surprising that the rich treasury of New Testament truth, should be supposed to have been fully opened to Old Testament saints.

But if we would determine the organic relation of the two Testaments aright, it needs to be clearly understood that the word of revelation, as a communication of divine truth, cannot be sundered from the history of revelation, as a communication of divine life. It is a mistake to suppose that revelation is for the theoretical understanding simply; it is for man in the totality of his being, and consists in the gradual and progressive self-manifestation and self-communication of God, in order that man, and through him the creation in general, at the head of which man stands, may be filled and glorified with the divine life, and that thus he may reach the perfection of his existence in God, and God may be all in all. Revelation is possible in a fallen world only in the form of redemption. In revelation, God comes into history more and more fully, until in the incarnation He reveals the fulness of His life in the bosom of the world's life, that He may redeem it from sin and glorify it in Himself. In Christ therefore, we have the absolute revelation, for which all antecedent revelation served merely as a preparation, by educating man to apprehend by faith the glorious mystery of the Word made flesh.

The preparation, however, was necessary as well as real. The incarnation could be no abrupt, sudden phenomenon. As such it would have been magical, not historical. An actual entrance of God into history for the purposes of salvation could be effected only by conforming to the law of all history, the law of gradual progressive development. And in truth, this is the form which the religion of the Old Testament assumed. It is one life flowing in unbroken continuity from Abraham to Christ; yet, like all life, unfolding itself in a

series of stages, in which the truth of each lower stage comes to an ever fuller and clearer expression in the higher stages, and in which each higher stage is adumbrated, and at the same time mediated from the beginning by the lower. Starting in the individual, it widens into the family, and then into the nation, to become at last a universal possession in Christ. It first takes the form of Promise, then of Law, and finally in Prophetism, it looks to the breaking up of an old order of things, and the advent of a new.

In the very nature of the case, the religion of the Old Testament and that of the New must be inwardly conjoined. In both there is the presence of the same spirit, and together they constitute the one true religion, in which there are, indeed, stages of development, but no fundamental contradictions. United by one central principle, the formal side of which is revelation and the material side redemption, their aim is not primarily theoretical, to furnish the human mind with a knowledge of God, but practical, to bring salvation from God to man. And since knowledge and life are everywhere inwardly related, the doctrinal apprehension of salvation is necessarily conditioned by the actual history of salvation. There are stages of progress in the one as well as in the other; and if we fail to recognize this fact, we shall fail to comprehend the relation of the Old Testament to the New.

Salvation, not doctrine, is the grand aim of revealed religion. But the religion of the Old Testament, even in the highest stage of its development, was incapable of bringing the true salvation. Promise might awaken the hope of it; the discipline of the Mosaic Law might generate the sense of its need; prophecy might point to its certain advent; but neither promise, nor law, nor prophecy could do more than prepare the way for its actual accomplishment. In this regard the religion of the Old Testament was only a shadow and type, not the reality itself. It was the religion of a salvation that was really coming in the divinely guided history of Israel, but which had not yet actually come; a religion in which the divine was mirrored in holy, yet external, symbolical and transient

forms ; in which the perfect life was as yet only an ideal hovering before the pious mind in the form of law ; in which God and man, heaven and earth, were seeking to come, but never really came, into a living and abiding union.

Christianity, on the other hand, is the religion of a salvation, fully brought to pass ; in which the Divine is not enshrined in holy symbols, but personally incarnate in human form ; which confronts the trembling sinner not as a threatening law, but as a life-giving power ; in which God and man, heaven and earth are really and forever one in Christ ;—in a word, it is the religion of the incarnation, of the eternal reconciliation of all antitheses, and of the final glorification of all existence.\*

It is in this light that we must study the Old Testament records. Without its guidance we shall assuredly go astray. If, on the one hand, we ignore the teleological character of the Old Testament revelation, we shall be exposed to the danger of rationalism ; for we shall be affrighted by the manifold difficulties of a critical, dogmatic and ethical kind, and fail to see that these lie on the surface only and do not touch the inner life. If, on the other hand, we lose sight of its historical character, we shall be betrayed into that exaggerated view of the Old Testament, which lifts it up well nigh to the level of the New. A forced exegesis will become a necessity, and we shall read into the inspired record our own arbitrary conceits.

"*Vetus Testamentum in Novo patet, Novum in Vetere latet,*" is indeed true in the sense that the Old is the undeveloped germ, the New the ripened fruit. There is no New Testament doctrine that is entirely new and whose roots do not strike far back into the Old. On the other hand, there is no Old Testament doctrine that is peculiar to the Old and that does not assume a higher form in the New. It is not true, however, that New Testament doctrine in its New Testament form was present to the minds of Old Testament saints. Such an assertion would be at variance with historical fact.

It is of great importance that the mutual relation between the

---

\* Schultz: *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, p. 70.



two Testaments be rightly understood. If misconceived, it may be turned into a dangerous weapon for attacking Christianity. "If, on the one hand, the connection between them is either severed or depreciated, Christianity will, by means of that character of novelty which is thus in a one-sided way impressed upon it, be placed in an insecure position, deprived of its historical basis, and exposed to the suspicion of having originated in subjective arbitrariness. If, on the other hand, the connection between the two is enhanced to actual identity, and not viewed as exclusively the connection of a deeply felt want and its supply (Matt. v. 3), the suspicion will arise—as many recent appearances show—that a transference of Old Testament occurrences, images and Messianic features to the person of Jesus of Nazareth is the source of the Gospel history. Such a suspicion it will be difficult to obviate on historical grounds, and all that is new in Christianity will thus be reduced to its carrying out of these principles to universalism. And the more literal the fulfilment of Old Testament sayings found in the New, the more difficult will it be to dispel the suspicion that the former is the source of the latter. But the more we succeed in showing, in a truly historical manner, that the essentially self-consistent image of Christ found in the books of the New Testament, is by no means simply identical with the Messianic idea of the Old, and still less so with the discordant and self-contradictory Messianic expectations of His contemporaries; that, on the contrary, the fulfilment, both on the whole and in particular, far surpassed those limitations by which even prophecy was restricted; that there is moreover, a real teleological connection between the Gospel in general and the one organic whole formed by the history of the Old Testament, so that what was deposited and prepared in remote ages attains its fulfilment in Christ—the more will both the novelty and originality, as well as the historical basis of the appearance of Christianity, 'when the fulness of time was come,' be established."\*

---

\* *Dorner's History of Protestant Theology*, Vol. II. p. 445.

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

**MODERN DOUBT AND CHRISTIAN BELIEF.** A Series of Apologetic Lectures addressed to earnest seekers after Truth. By Theodore Christlieb, D. D., University Preacher and Professor of Theology at Bonn. Translated with the author's sanction, chiefly by the Rev. H. M. Weitbrecht, Ph. D., and edited by the Rev. T. L. Kingsbury, M. A., Vicar of Easton Royal, and Rural Dean New York; Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 1874.

This is truly one of the substantial works of the present day. It is a work on Apologetics which is eminently adapted to the wants of the present time. It exhibits on every page a spirit of respect for what has been done in the department of Apologetics in the past, and yet the whole work shows plainly that the author understands fully the necessity for a reconstruction of the science. He maintains throughout a firm and unyielding position in regard to the truth of revelation, never compromising in the least, yet he gives to reason and philosophy their due.

In the opening lecture, extending over sixty-seven pages, he considers "the existing breach between Modern Culture and Christianity. 1. Causes of the breach—causes historical, philosophical, ecclesiastical, political, social and ethical. 2. Present extent of the breach. 3. Can the breach be filled up?"

A good deal of the interest of the work concentrates in this third division of the first lecture. The author shows most conclusively that there can be no real contradiction between Christianity and true Science and Culture, and seems hopeful that the breach that has come to have place actually between them may be overcome. Theology must not seek to antagonize science, but only correct its false claims, and science must learn to accept the light that comes from revelation. It is the special vocation of the Teutonic races and Protestant Christianity to work in the solution of this problem. We agree with the learned author that science and revelation cannot contradict each other, but whether their actual interpretation will ever come to a full understanding must be left for history to determine. Meantime it is of the utmost importance that the Christian Church should assume the right attitude towards the culture of the age and seek to win it to the truth.

The second lecture is on Reason and Revelation, running to page 135, and contains a lucid and masterly treatment of this difficult

subject. We do not feel entirely satisfied with the author's answer to the question, "whether reason is to be regarded as a material source of knowledge, or as a mere faculty?" We would not identify *thinking* with *being*, as Hegel does, but neither would we make thinking purely formal and receptive. The ideas of reason imply contact and communion with real being, we believe, but, as the author truly says, these ideas can come to be filled with proper contents only as we receive the truth into us through divine revelation. The revelation of God in nature must fail for man without the supernatural revelation in Christ, through whom alone man can come to the knowledge of God, and above all to living communion with Him.

The third lecture is devoted to a consideration and criticism of "Modern non-biblical conceptions of God." These are Atheism, Materialism, Pantheism, Deism and Rationalism. The fourth lecture considers "The theology of Scripture and the Church in relation to these errors." Then in the fifth there is an able discussion of the nature of Miracles, with reference to the modern objections. Lecture sixth takes up "Modern Anti-miraculous accounts of the life of Christ." Seventh, "Modern denials of the Resurrection," and eighth, "The modern critical theory of Primitive Christianity."

The whole work is an *octavo* volume of 549 pages. Next after *Dorner's History of Protestant Theology* we regard it as one of the most interesting and vigorous works that Germany has produced in the present age. It is felt on all sides that Christian Apologetics needs a reconstruction in the contest with the skepticism of the present century. The present work opens the way and points to results of the most promising character in the new theological literature which the age is producing. We commend this volume to all earnest readers, especially to the ministry.

**ISRAEL IN EGYPT.** Egypt's Place among the Ancient Monarchies

With more than 200 illustrations. By Edward L. Clark. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

A most beautiful ornamental volume, published on tinted paper and handsomely illustrated. The matter of the book is highly interesting. Egypt, the cradle of civilization, the country that formed a large and powerful empire when Israel was but a colony, the land in which the Israelites dwelt, and from which in later years God called His Son! Egypt the land of the Nile, of the Pyramids! Here we have described in animated style and beautiful language its Temples, its Home Life, the River, the People at Work, the Religion, from which so much was derived in the religion of Israel, the Land of the Dead, the Story of Egypt, and the Exodus of the Israelites. The reader is carried along without weariness. The descriptions are terse and graphic. The author gives us results of patient and scholarly investigation set in life pictures. No one can read the work without profit and pleasure.

THE CATACOMBS OF ROME AND THEIR TESTIMONY RELATIVE TO PRIMITIVE CHRISTIANITY. By the Rev. W. H. Withrow, M.A. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

Another ornamental volume fully illustrated, though gotten up in plainer and cheaper style. The subject is one of great interest to the Christian reader. What these Catacombs were originally intended for is not certainly known. We know that they became the place of worship and then of burial for the early Christians when they had to conceal themselves from their enemies during the times of persecution. Far down under ground there are about 1200 miles of winding ways, where, it is estimated 6,000,000 of Christians were buried.

In book first the author gives "the structure and history of the Catacombs;" book second, "the art and symbolism of the Catacombs;" and book third; "the inscriptions of the Catacombs." The writer has endeavored to illustrate the subject by frequent pagan sepulchral inscriptions, and by citations from the writings of the Fathers, which often throw much light on the condition of early Christian society. The value of the work is greatly enhanced, it is thought, by the addition of many hundreds of early Christian inscriptions carefully translated, a very large proportion of which have never appeared in English.

The last chapter is devoted to the ministry, rites, and institutions of the Primitive Church, in which the author makes a number of points against the claims of the Roman theory. Some of these are no doubt valid, but the controversial character of this chapter does not, in our opinion, add to the interest of the book. In its place this would not be objectionable, but the interesting and beautiful story of these early Christians leads one to feel averse to polemics. We have found much interest and pleasure in reading this volume.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF HERBERT SPENCER. With an examination of the First Principles of his System. By B. P. Bowne, A. B. New York: Nelson & Phillips, Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

Herbert Spencer is one of the chief advocates of a new school of philosophy which seeks to account for the present condition of the universe according to the law of evolution, so as to rule out any activity that transcends the universe. He is not an atheist, and he denies that his system is atheistic, on the ground God is unknowable, and therefore all knowledge of Him belongs not to science, but to belief. It is atheism in science which he advocates, even though he denies the charge. Kant made the world unknowable, that is, we cannot know the thing—in—itself. There is a contradiction here of our own consciousness. Man has a consciousness of himself, of

the world, and of God. To deny either of these is to close our own eyes. We cannot take a single step in knowledge of any kind.

But it follows that any system that starts with a denial of the data of consciousness must become involved at every point in error, and can appear to maintain itself only by the use of sophistry. Prof. Ulrici has shown this in a masterly way in his criticism of Strauss' last work. And his argument applies as well to Herbert Spencer's system. In this little work the ground is travelled over in a series of essays forming a united argument. What is Evolution? Laws of the Unknowable, Laws of the Knowable, Principles of Psychology, The Theistic Argument, Summary and Conclusion, are the titles of the different chapters.

Herbert Spencer's writings are among the most plausible and fascinating of the school to which he belongs, and there is enough truth in the evolution theory to give strength to the system he advocates. The answer to it must seek to separate the truth from the error, so as to conserve the former while it repudiates the latter. This, we think, is done by Mr. Bowne. He writes at Halle, from a German University, and seems to be well posted in the latest researches of German learning. Those who are interested in philosophical writings will be pleased with this volume.

**STRAUSS AS A PHILOSOPHICAL THINKER.** A Review of his book, "The Old Faith and the New Faith," and a Confutation of its Materialistic Views by Hermann Ulrici. Translated, with an Introduction by Charles P. Krauth, D. D., Vice-Provost of the University of Pennsylvania. Philadelpha: Smith, English & Co., 710 Arch Street. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1874.

An unpretending but very solid little volume of 165 pages, about one half of which is occupied by Dr. Krauth's introduction. This introduction serves a valuable purpose in opening up the general subject, and gives an outline of the literature that has been called out by Strauss.

Dr. Hermann Ulrici is Professor of Philosophy in the University at Halle. He leaves for theologians the refutation of Strauss on dogmatic grounds, while he proceeds to show in this article, or treatise, that he is unreliable as a philosophical thinker. Rejecting revelation Strauss, of course, professes to build up his New Faith on philosophical principles, Ulrici meets him on his own ground. If any one wishes to read a keen philosophical criticism let him turn to the brief chapters of this little book. It will not be found easy or light reading. To follow the argumentation requires close and disciplined thinking. But the reader is amply repaid for his work.

Strauss has been answered and put to confusion from many sides by the theologians of Germany, but the scientific opposition to Christianity in our day must also be met by men of science. A theologian is not usually just the one to enter this field. There is a feeling

that he is not quite the equal of his opponent in the sphere of science. Hence besides the theological argument against Darwinism, the scientific argument has special value. Agassiz, for instance, would have inspired more confidence in this field than is inspired by the little work of Dr. Hodge. He is a theologian, but likely to fall into some mistakes when treating his subject from the stand-point of pure science. But in the work here noticed we have the master—the philosopher—answering one who ventured to overthrow Christianity on the basis of philosophy. Strauss is here answered, and entirely demolished we think, on his own territory. We see here the great advantage of true philosophical training. It cannot make known the truths of revelation, but it can answer a false philosophy that attempts to overthrow the true religion.

**MODERN SKEPTICISM: A Journey through the land of doubt and back again. A Life Story.** By Joseph Barker. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 1874.

No doubt many of the readers of this Review will remember the somewhat notorious discussion between Dr. Berg and Joseph Barker in Concert Hall, Philadelphia, 1854. It produced a good deal of noise at the time and was attended by large and excited audiences. Mr. Barker in this work says that Dr. Berg undertook to prove too much and failed, that he was substantially right, but logically wrong, a testimony to the truth that the Bible may be defended in a way that adds nothing to the strength of the true evidences of Christianity.

Mr. Barker was originally a Methodist preacher and gradually fell under the power of skepticism until he avowed himself an infidel. He fell from the faith, not through immorality of life, but through doubts in regard to Christianity, which had their origin in part no doubt in the one-sided and defective manner in which Christ is preached by many. His recovery seems to have been genuine. He seeks now to repair, as far as possible, the evil he did by disseminating infidel views. The book is a readable volume, though it might have been condensed, we think, to advantage.

**THE SUPERHUMAN ORIGIN OF THE BIBLE INFERRED FROM ITSELF.**

By Henry Rogers. Author of the "Eclipse of Faith." New York:—Scribner, Armstrong & Co., 654 Broadway, 1874.

A substantial volume of 465 pages, consisting of a course of lectures, which the author was not able to deliver on account of ill health. They are published, it seems, under the direction of the "Committee of the Union," though who or what that committee is the preface fails to inform us. The author dates the preface from Pennal Tower, Machyulleth.

The subject here treated, though belonging to the same general department to which Dr. Christlieb's work belongs, pertains to the

formal side of divine revelation, the Bible. It is fresh and vigorous and will well repay a perusal. It contains ten lectures and an appendix.

These works on the Evidences of Christianity, as Dr. Christlieb remarks, are more generally read by believers than unbelievers. They possess an interest and value, not only in arming believers against the assaults of unbelief, but, as is the case in the present volume, they unfold positively new views of the truth itself for Christians. A careful reading of this work will be found both pleasant and profitable.

**THE REVELATION OF ST. JOHN.** Expounded by John Peter Lange, D. D., Professor of Theology in the University of Bonn. Translated from the German by Evelina Moore. Enlarged and edited by E. R. Craven, D. D., Pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church at Newark, N. J. Together with a double Alphabetical Index to all the ten volumes of the New Testament, by John H. Woods, A. M. New York: Scribner, Armstrong & Co, 654 Broadway, 1874.

This volume completes the translation of Lange's Commentary on the New Testament. Lange undoubtedly possesses special qualifications for the contribution he here makes to the interpretation of this last of the New Testament books. He presents an epitome of the literature on the subject, and, as in the case of the previous volumes, the reader will here find a notice of pretty much all that is known and has been written on this difficult book. This volume will no doubt be eagerly sought for and studied. Dr. Schaff must enjoy a great satisfaction in having brought this Commentary on the New Testament to a close.

**THE LIFE OF RUDOLF STIER,** (From German sources). By John P. Lacroix. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

This life of Stier is made up of material gathered from a monograph by Dr. Carl Nitzsch, an essay by Dr. Tholuck in Herzog's Encyclopedia, letters from friends and relatives of Stier, and a Life of Stier by his two sons. We think the author has done a good service by presenting this biography to the English reading public. Stier is widely known through his commentaries, his Words of Jesus, Words of the Apostles, &c. He commenced his University studies at Berlin under Schleiermacher, De Wette, and Solger, and then studied at Halle under Knapp, Gesenius, and Wegscheider. He was repelled by the rationalism of the times and took refuge in a life tinged somewhat with pietism. His various labors and experiences are here portrayed in a way to furnish much interest and pleasure to the reader.



**HAND-BOOK OF BIBLE MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.** By James M. Freeman, A. M. Illustrated by one hundred and sixty-eight engravings. New York : Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati : Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

Of books on the Bible there is no end. Some of them no doubt make the Sacred volume clearer and better understood, and some of them obscure it. The present volume is intended for popular use. It contains what is usually put in a work on Biblical Antiquities, but, according to its title, it aims at no scientific arrangement. It presents its subjects in alphabetical order. The amount of information presented is considerable, and the numerous plates are interesting. It would be a good volume for Sunday School libraries, and excellent also for the family.

**A LIFE THAT SPEAKETH.** A Biography of Rev. George P. Wilson. By Daniel Clark Knowles. New York : Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati : Hitchcock & Walden. Sunday-school Department.

**HOLINESS TO THE LORD.** By Rev. Lewis R. Dunn, author of "The Mission of the Spirit." New York : Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati : Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

**HOLINESS THE BIRTHRIGHT OF ALL GOD'S CHILDREN.** By Rev. J. T. Crane, D. D., of the Newark Conference. New York : Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati : Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

The first of these works is an interesting biography. The other two are devoted to a discussion of Christian Perfection, both claiming that, according to the teaching of Methodism, Christians may and should attain complete holiness, that is freedom from all sin, in this life. The theory, we think is based on a defective view of the Christian life, and the nature of our fallen life. The subject has awakened a good deal of attention of late in the Methodist, and to a certain extent in the Presbyterian Church.

**STAR OF OUR LORD : or Christ Jesus, King of All Worlds, Both of time and space.** With Thoughts on Inspiration and the Astronomic Doubt as to Christianity. By Francis W. Upham, author of "The Wise Men ; How they came to Jerusalem." New York : Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati : Hitchcock & Walden, 1873.

An extensive discussion of "The Star of our Lord." The author maintains that the star that appeared to the *Magi* was a new creation, and that the Eastern Sages were instructed by the mother of our Lord, and came to a full apprehension of the divinity of Christ, and so were born into the Kingdom of heaven before the time,—a conclusion hardly warranted, we think, by the Scripture narrative.

LIFE-STORY OF REV. DAVIS WASGATT CLARK, D. D., Bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church. Compiled from original sources. By Daniel Curry, D. D. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

SIGHTS AND INSIGHTS: or Knowledge By Travel. By Rev. Henry W. Warren. Three Illustrations. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

It is not an easy task to write a book of travels at the present day that will interest the reader. We have so many of them that repeat the same story, mostly following the guide books. The present is an exception. The style is terse, keen, and incisive. The writer carries you along without weariness, holding your attention steadily to the end. He begins with a visit to Niagara and other points of interest, and only then takes you to Europe, Egypt and Palestine. Seldom can one find so much information in a small space. The writer is sharp and keen, sometimes tempted to become a little too much so, and the reader is for a moment tempted to think he is showing off his smartness—but this thought soon departs and leaves him in good humor with the author. We can recommend it as an interesting volume.

ON "HOLY GROUND." By Edwin Hodder, author of "Memories of New Zealand Life," "Tossed on the Waves," "The Junior Clerk," &c. New York: Nelson & Phillips. Cincinnati: Hitchcock & Walden, 1874.

An interesting account of a journey through the Holy Land, professing to give a faithful picture of it as it now is, as well as to hold up its former greatness and glory. Nothing need be said to commend the subject here treated, and the style is pleasing.

SOLAR HIEROGLYPHICS: or the Emblematic Illustrations of the Revealed Doctrine of the Tri-Personal Godhead, which are discernible in the Solar light. With an introduction by Rev. J. Grier Ralston, D. D. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co., 714 Arch Street, 1874.

Light is a symbol of God. It has three constituents, the *actinic*, the *luminiferous*, and the *calorific*—illustrating the Trinity. The blue represents the Father, the yellow, the Son, and the red, the Holy Spirit, others make the red, or caloric represent the Father, the yellow, the Son, and the blue, or chemical, the Spirit. An interesting analogy of the mystery of the Trinity.